DEVIVIER W 059528
CHRISTIAN APOLOGETICS
BTQ-213
D45 V2

St. Joseph's College Library
54th and City Line
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19131

DEMCO

Christian Apologetics

OR

A RATIONAL EXPOSITION OF THE FOUNDATIONS OF FAITH,

BY

REV. W. DEVIVIER, S. J.

TRANSLATED FROM THE SIXTEENTH EDITION OF THE ORIGINAL FRENCH.

PRECEDED BY AN INTRODUCTION ON

THE EXISTENCE AND ATTRIBUTES OF GOD,

AND A TREATISE ON

THE HUMAN SOUL; ITS LIBERTY, SPIRITUALITY, IMMORTALITY AND DESTINY,

BY

REV. L. PEETERS, S. J.

EDITED, AUGMENTED AND ADAPTED TO ENGLISH READERS

BY

REV. JOSEPH C. SASIA, S. J.

59528

BX 1751 .D45 v.2

ST. JOSEPH'S UNIVERSITY STX
BTQ 213 .D45 v. 2
Christian apologetics :
3 9353 00019 5337

OVERBROOK, PENNA. ST. JOSEPH'S COLLEGE 1852

VOLUME II.

PRICE, $2.50 FOR THE TWO VOLUMES, WHICH ARE NOT SOLD SEPARATELY.

SAN JOSE, CAL.:
POPP & HOGAN, PRINTERS,
1903.

Copyright, 1903,
by
Rev. Joseph C. Sasia, S. J.

TO HIS GRACE,

Most Reverend Patrick William Riordan, D. D.,

Archbishop of San Francisco, California,

Learned, Zealous Defender of Catholic Truth, this Work,

written in defense of that Truth, is humbly,

affectionately dedicated by the Editor,

Joseph C. Sasia, S. J.

St. Joseph's Church,
San Jose, Cal.
1903.

St. Mary's Cathedral,
San Francisco, California.

It gives me great pleasure to add my name to those of the distinguished Archbishops and Bishops who have given their approval to the work "Christian Apologetics," by Rev. W. Devivier, S. J., which work is now reproduced in our language, edited, augmented and adapted to English readers by the Rev. Joseph C. Sasia, S. J.

I recommend it in a very special manner to the Rev. Clergy, teachers in our Catholic Institutions, and advanced pupils in our Colleges and Academies. It contains a very able and complete exposition of the doctrines of our Religion, and a refutation of the objections which are made to it, especially those urged by so-called scientists.

I sincerely hope that this valuable work will meet with the encouragement it so richly deserves.

† *PATRICK W. RIORDAN,*
Archbishop of San Francisco.

June 4, 1903.

Imprimatur,
† *P. W. RIORDAN,*
Archbishop of San Francisco.
June 4, 1903.

The undersigned, Superior of the California Mission of the Society of Jesus, in virtue of faculties granted to him by the Very Reverend Louis Martin, General of the same Society, hereby permits the publication of a book entitled "Christian Apologetics, or A Rational Exposition of the Foundations of Faith," by Rev. W. Devivier, S. J., the same having been approved by the censors appointed to revise it.

JOHN P. FRIEDEN, S. J.

St. Ignatius College,
San Francisco, Cal.
June 4, 1903.

APPROBATIONS

His Eminence Cardinal Mermillod.

June 13, 1887.

I read with the liveliest interest your Course of Christian Apologetics, in which you set forth in a vigorous manner the proofs of the Divinity of the Christian Religion and of the Roman Catholic Church. The reader cannot fail to recognize in your pages the masterly work of an eloquent Professor; method, lucidity, precision united with brevity, such are the leading characteristics of your book.

His Eminence Cardinal Desprez, Archbishop of Toulouse.

March 21st, 1886.

You have given us in your volume an excellent summary of Fundamental Theology. Though intended particularly for Catholic students in the higher classes of our Colleges, yet your book will be read with profit by all persons of average culture, who are anxious to complete their study of Religion. I am glad to see that, besides giving the most forcible arguments in favor of Catholic doctrines, you also triumphantly refute the sophistic reasonings of our opponents.

His Eminence Cardinal Mazzella, S. J.

To solidity of doctrine you have joined such a clearness of exposition as to render your Christian Apologetics perfectly suitable to the intelligence of the Catholic student. Your work should become the classical text-book in our Catholic Colleges for the higher study of our holy Religion.

Monseigneur Fonteneau, Archbishop of Albi.

September 18th, 1886.

Under a modest title you have condensed in your work all the arguments that Catholic doctrine opposes against modern unbelief. Exegesis, philosophy, theology, history, physical sciences, political economy, both divine and human knowledge concur in demonstrating, in an irrefutable manner, the admirable harmony existing between the dictates of human reason and the voice of Divine Revelation. The proofs, you allege, are abundant, well chosen and clearly presented. Your style of arguing is forcible, clear and precise. Hence I ardently desire to see your work in all the libraries of my seminaries and of my priests.

His Lordship Mgr. Heylen, Bishop of Namur, Belgium.

NAMUR, September 6, 1901.

My Reverend and very dear Father:

You have kindly presented to me a copy of the 16th edition of your *Course of Christian Apologetics*. I accept it with deep gratitude. I am glad that I also have an opportunity of offering you my congratulations on your work. The extraordinary success which it has met with everywhere is a sufficient testimony of its merits, as it appears from the eulogies of many of the most distinguished Bishops and Prelates of Belgium and France.

The very attacks, made against it by our enemies, furnish an additional proof of the sterling value of your work, written in defense of Religion and the Church. I am sure that this book shall continue to be highly beneficial to our Christian youths, who find in it not only a clear exposition and an exact solution of the most important questions of Christian Apologetics, but also the method of refuting the most specious objections raised by modern unbelievers.

Reverend dear Father, please accept the expression of my most sincere and affectionate sentiments.

†TH. LOUIS, Bishop of Namur.

Recommendations of this work, couched in similar, highly eulogistic terms, have reached the author from the following distinguished personages: His Eminence Cardinal Agostini, Patriarch of Venice; Mgr. Walravens, Bishop of Tournay; Mgr. Delannoy, Bishop of Aire and Dax; Mgr. Isoard, Bishop of Annecy; Mgr. Rougerie, Bishop of Pamiers; Mgr. Lambrecht, Bishop of Gand; Mgr. Cortet, Bishop of Troyes; Mgr. Germain, Bishop of Coutances; Mgr. Billard, Bishop of Carcassonne; Mgr. Gilly, Bishop of Nimes; Mgr. Sonnois, Bishop of Saint-Dié; Mgr. Rossett, Bishop of Maurienne; His Eminence Cardinal Goossens, Archbishop of Malines; His Eminence Cardinal Place, Archbishop of Rennes; Mgr. Hasley, Archbishop of Cambray; Mgr. y Moreno y Mazon, Archbishop of Granada; Mgr. Vigne, Bishop of Avignon; Mgr. Foulon, Archbishop of Besançon; Mgr. Leuilleux, Archbishop of Chambery; Mgr. Gouthe-Soulard, Bishop of Aix; Mgr. Waffelaert, Bishop of Bruges; Mgr. Sebaux, Bishop of Angouleme; Mgr. Dennel, Bishop of Arras; Mgr. Mortier, Bishop of Digne; Mgr. Doutreloux, Bishop of Liege; Mgr. Goux, Bishop of Versailles; Mgr. Nouvel, Bishop of Quimper; Mgr. Bourret, Bishop of Rodez; Mgr. Koppes, Bishop of Luxembourg; Mgr. Pagés, Bishop of Tarentaise; Mgr. Cœuret-Varin, Bishop of Agen; Mgr. Hugonin, Bishop of Bayeux; Mgr. Grimordias, Bishop of Cahors; Mgr. Marpot, Bishop of Saint-Claude, and other notable authorities.

See also the commendatory reviews that appeared in the following

publications: Bibliographique Catholique for September, 1885. The Précis Historiques for February, 1886. The Polybiblion for March, 1887. Civiltá Cattolica, 1888.

This Course of Apologetics has been translated into several other languages.

The work bears the *Imprimatur* of Reverend Augustus Petit, Provincial of the Society of Jesus in Belgium; and the approval of the Ecclesiastical Authority of the Diocese of Tournai, where it was published.

CONTENTS

OF

CHRISTIAN APOLOGETICS.

SECOND PART.

The Roman Catholic Church.

CHAPTER I.

PAGE.

General Preliminary Remarks 353

§ 1. Object and Division of the Second Part 353

§ 2. General Ideas concerning the Church 355

CHAPTER II.

The Roman Church is the True Church of Jesus Christ 364

ART. I. The Marks of the True Church of Jesus Christ 365

§ 1. Marks of the Church in General 365

§ 2. Division of the Marks of the Church 366

§ 3. Positive Marks 367

A. Unity 367

B. Sanctity 375

C. Catholicity or Universality 377

D. Apostolicity 380

Remarks on the two-fold Power of Order and Jurisdiction ... 384

ART. II. Application of the Notes or Marks of the True Church of Christ 388

The Roman Church Possesses the four Positive Marks of the True Church 388

§ 1. Unity 388

Answer to Objection raised from the Schism of the West 392

§ 2. Sanctity 397

§ 3. Catholicity 401

§ 4. Apostolicity 403

ART. III. Protestantism does not possess the Marks of the true Church of Jesus Christ 407

§ 1. Protestantism is absolutely devoid of Unity, either in Doctrine, or in Ministry or Government 409

PAGE.

§ 2. Protestantism does not possess the Mark of Sanctity.... 415
§ 3. Protestantism does not possess the Mark of Catholicity or Universality 420
§ 4. Protestantism does not possess the Mark of Apostolicity 421
§ 5. In its rule of Faith Protestantism contradicts Jesus Christ..... 425
§ 6. Church of England's Fallacious Rule of Faith..... 432
§ 7. Declaration of the Catholic Bishops of Great Britain on the Teaching and Practice of the Catholic Church regarding Holy Scripture..... 437
Conclusion of Article III..... 442
Inspiration of the Sacred Books and Tradition..... 442

ART. IV. The Oriental Schismatic Church does not possess the Marks of the True Church..... 445
Historical Notice..... 446
§ 1. It possesses neither perfect Unity of Belief, nor Unity of Ministry, nor Unity of Government 452
§ 2. It does not possess the Mark of Sanctity..... 456
§ 3. It does not possess the mark of Catholicity..... 456
§ 4. It does not possess the Mark of Apostolicity 458

ART. V. The Primacy of the See of Peter, or the Papacy..... 460
§ 1. First Thesis—Jesus Christ conferred upon St. Peter the Primacy of Jurisdiction over the whole Church..... 461
§ 2. Second Thesis—Jesus Christ intended that the Primacy should be transmitted to the Successors of St. Peter... 468
§ 3. Third Thesis—It is the Church of Rome that possesses the Primacy of the See of St. Peter 471

CHAPTER III.

Of some Prerogatives conferred by Jesus Christ upon His Church..... 483

ART. I. The Indefectibility of the Church..... 483
ART. II. Authority or Powers of the Church of Christ..... 486
1. Power to Teach..... 488
2. Power of administering the Sacraments..... 490
3. Power to Govern 491

ART. III. Infallibility of the Church and of the Pope 493
§ 1. Its Nature and Necessity..... 493
§ 2. Object of Infallibility or Matters on which it is exercised 501
§ 3. Subject of Infallibility, or in Whom it resides 503
A. Infallibility of the Teaching Church..... 503
B. Infallibility of the Roman Pontiff..... 504
§ 4. Conditions of Infallibility..... 508

ART. IV. Relation between Church and State 509

PAGE.

§ 1. Independence of the Spiritual Power in its own Sphere of Action 512
§ 2. Independence of the Civil Power within its own jurisdiction 514
§ 3. Rights of the Church 516
§ 4. Rights of the Church in case of Conflict with Civil Rulers 517
§ 5. The Church and the State must mutually help each other 519
§ 6. The Church owes Assistance and Protection to the State 519
§ 7. The Temporal Power in its turn owes Aid and Protection to the Church 520

ART. V. Liberalism and Liberty 525
§ 1. General Notions concerning Liberalism 525
§ 2. Modern Liberties 532
§ 3. Tolerance—Its true Concept 540
§ 4. A few Considerations concerning Liberty and its different Kinds 547

CHAPTER IV.

Of certain Accusations brought against the Catholic Church 557
§ 1. The Intolerance of the Church 558
1. In what Sense is the Catholic Church Intolerant 558
2. Protestant Intolerance 559
3. Intolerance of the other Enemies of the Church 566
4. Of the Maxim: Out of the Church there is no Salvation 568
§ 2. The Vicious Circle 576
§ 3. The Inquisition 584
1. Origin and Nature of the Ecclesiastical Inquisition. 585
2. Lawfulness of the Inquisition in Principle 587
3. What should be thought of the Proceedings of the Inquisition in General and of the Spanish Inquisition in Particular 591
§ 4. The Process of Galileo 608
1. The Error contained in the Decree of 1616 proves nothing against the Infallibility of the Church, or against the Infallibility of the Pope 609
2. Is the Church opposed to Scientific Progress, and was Galileo a martyr to Science? 619
§ 5. The Massacre on the Eve of St. Bartholomew's Day 624
Religion had no part whatever in that Massacre 625
§ 6. The Crusades 629
1. Lawfulness of the Crusades 630
2. Results of the Crusades 632

PAGE.

§ 7. The Wars of Religion 634
§ 8. The Revocation of the Edict of Nantes 636
1. Was that Revocation Legitimate 637
2. Was it Expedient or Opportune? 638
3. What is to be thought of its Execution and of its Results? 639
§ 9. The Authority exercised by the Popes during the Middle Ages over the Temporal Power of Princes 642
1. The Power exercised by the Popes during the Middle Ages over Christian Rulers was perfectly Legitimate 642
2. The Popes have made use of their right in a manner most salutary to society 649
§ 10. The Temporal Power of the Popes 650
§ 11. The Bad Popes 655
1. Can there be Bad Popes? 655
2. In reality have there been many Bad Popes? 657
§ 12. Other Charges and Objections from Non-Catholics 660

CHAPTER V.

The Church and Civilization 665

ART. I. State or Condition of the Pagan World before Jesus Christ, or Pagan Civilization 666
§ 1. General View 666
§ 2. The Fate of Individuals before the Coming of Jesus Christ 670
1. Slavery 670
2. Gladiators 672
3. The Poor and the Unfortunate 674
4. Laborers 675
§ 3. The Family before the Coming of Christ 675
§ 4. Public Society, or the State before the Coming of Jesus Christ, and its Relations with other Nations 676

ART. II. State of the World after the Coming of Jesus Christ, or Christian Civilization 679
§ 1. General View 679
§ 2. The Condition of Individuals after the Coming of Jesus Christ 681
1. The Slaves 681
2. The Gladiators 683
3. The Poor and the Unfortunate 685
4. The Laborers, or the Working Classes 686
§ 3. The Family after the Coming of Jesus Christ 687
§ 4. Civil Society after the Coming of Jesus Christ and Relations between Nations 688

PAGE.

§ 5. Transformation, or Conversion of the Barbarians after the Coming of Christ 689
§ 6. Catholic and Protestant Nations compared 693
ART. III. The Church and Intellectual Culture 705
§ 1. Influence of the Church on the cultivation of Learning, Literature and Science 705
§ 2. The Church and the Fine Arts 713
§ 3. The Church and Education 715
1. Popular Instruction 715
2. Superior and Secondary Education 723
§ 4. The Church and Science 729
1. Some Distinguished Catholic Scientists 731
2. Universities founded by Catholic Kings and Princes, and often under immediate Papal Inspiration 733
3. Theological Studies 737
General Conclusion of this Work 738

SECOND PART.

THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

General Preliminary Remarks.

§ I. Object and Division of the Second Part.

298. OBJECT. Basing our arguments upon the Old and the New Testaments, historical documents of unquestionable authority, we have proven in a peremptory, decisive manner, the divinity of the Christian religion. But here we are pertinently asked, *where is true Christianity* to be found, such as it was preached and enjoined by Jesus Christ? This is the important question which we have now to solve.

The Christian religion, instituted, as it was, to be *practiced* by all men, could not exist in an abstract state. It lives in a *concrete* society bearing the name of Church, a visible society, which professes the doctrine of Christ and observes His laws.

But there are many religious societies, which claim to be invested with the divine mission of preserving in its entirety and full integrity the teaching of Jesus Christ and of transmitting it from age to age until the end of the world. And yet it is manifest, and we shall soon prove it, that among these manifold churches, which differ among themselves in the articles of faith to be believed, in the moral laws to be observed, and in the worship to be practiced, *one* alone must be the true Church; the others cannot be

anything else but sects repudiated by Jesus Christ, whose name they unworthily assume.

The special object of the second part of this Course is to enable the reader to discern with certainty *the Church founded by Jesus Christ*; to show that the Roman Church, which has the Pope as her Supreme Head, has alone the right to claim our belief, our respect, our obedience and love.

REMARK. We need not in this work concern ourselves about Christian communities which have disappeared centuries ago, hardly leaving any vestiges of their existence in history. Already in his time St. Augustin counted over eighty heresies completely extinct before his day; and in the XVI century Cardinal Bellarmin, after citing the names of two hundred heresies anterior to Luther added: "All these sects have perished; there is hardly to be found in the East a remnant of the Nestorians and Eutychians, and in Bohemia only a few old sectarian disciples of John Huss are known to survive." It will be easily understood that we have no object in bringing back to light these fragments of errors buried for ages in well-merited oblivion. It will suffice to compare with Catholicism the churches, which have preserved some sort of vitality, that is to say, the Protestant sects and the Schismatic Greek churches. The triumphant conclusion derived from this parallel will apply with more reason to the other anti-Catholic sects, whatever they be.

299. DIVISION. The following is the order which we shall follow in this demonstration:

In the first chapter we shall give *general ideas* concerning the Church founded by Jesus Christ, her nature, purpose, constitution, etc., without taking into consideration the claims of various Christian communities.

In a second chapter we shall show that this Church is *the Roman Catholic* Church, to the exclusion of every other Christian society.

In the third chapter we shall set forth more extended notions concerning some of *the prerogatives* conferred by

Jesus Christ upon the Catholic Church and her Supreme Head, and treat of the relations between Church and State.

The fourth chapter will be devoted to vindicating the Catholic Church from the principal charges made against her, especially in the name of history.

In the fifth and last chapter we shall say something about what the Roman Catholic Church has done, and never ceases to do, for the civilization and the happiness of mankind.

REMARK. In this part the discussion, as the reader may easily see, is placed on quite a different footing from that adopted in the first part of this Course. There, we could suppose that we had to deal with infidels, unbelievers, rationalists, who refused to acknowledge the divinity of the mission of Jesus Christ and the obligation incumbent upon man to embrace the religion established by Him. We have, therefore, used as proofs only historical documents and the truths of reason. Here, on the contrary, the discussion is engaged especially with the Greek Schismatics and Protestants, who, like us, believe in the divinity of Jesus Christ, and who admit the *inspiration* of the Sacred Books. Such being the case, we can bring forward as decisive arguments texts of the Old and New Testaments, *considered as the words of infallible truth.*

REMARK. We have nothing to do here with Protestant sects, that deny these two fundamental Truths, the divinity of Christ, and the authority of the Bible; for by so doing they forfeit all claim to be called Christians, and can be refuted, as other unbelievers, by other arguments; in fact they have already been refuted in the first part of this work.

§ II. General Ideas Concerning the Church.

300. I. DEFINITION OF THE CHURCH. To this word *Church* (in Latin Ecclesia—assembly) authors sometimes attribute an extended and at other times a more restricted sense. In the first sense, the Church is the union of *all the faithful servants of God*, who struggle on earth, who are

purified of their faults in purgatory, who triumph in heaven, including even the angels. Taken in the second acceptance of the term the Church is the assembly of the faithful *who combat on earth* (the Church militant). Taken in this second acceptation of the term, the Church may be said to comprise all the true worshippers of God, from the beginning of the world until the end of time; all of these indeed have believed or will believe in revealed religion, which is essentially the same in its three successive phases, the Primitive or Patriarchal, the Mosaic, and the Christian (n. 136-139). However, the name of Church is generally reserved for the *Christian* Church, as it exists in the world since the time that Jesus Christ has come to give to supernatural religion its highest perfection.

It is in this more restricted sense that we shall consider the Church in the present treatise. Thus understood, it may be defined: the society of the faithful instituted by Jesus Christ to preserve His doctrine, observe His laws, and, under the authority of His Vicar and the Bishops, attain in this way and by those means the last end of man, life eternal.

Hence the Church founded by Christ is rightly defined to be "The society of the validly baptized faithful united together in one body by the profession of the same faith, by the participation of the same sacraments, and by obedience to the same authority, Christ, its invisible head in heaven, and the Roman Pontiff, the successor of St. Peter, Christ's visible representative and vice-gerent upon earth.

301. II. The Christian Religion Constitutes a True Society, a Church. Rationalists, as we have seen, do not refuse to acknowledge in Jesus Christ the ideal type of human perfection; but however pure and splendid His virtue may be, He is, in their eyes, a mere mortal, and the Christian Church, and her organization, is not His work; it has in common with Him nothing but *the doctrine* which She professes. But if such be the case, how did the followers of Christ succeed in forming a society, in constituting a Church? The following is the explanation which they

venture to give. Christ, according to them, aimed at nothing else but the moral perfection and reform of Judaism. His disciples, constantly engaged in studying the doctrine of the Wise Man, whose life and teachings they admired; accustomed, moreover, to philosophical speculations and ever increasing in number, were naturally brought to form a society. For the idea of Christ and His doctrine, they substituted, step by step, that of a society formed by Him, and as they remembered the ancient glory of the Synagogue, they sheltered themselves under its shadow, until they became, they thought, strong enough to separate from it. Thus, say certain rationalists, and they hold that it was only in the second century that the Christian Church ventured to openly proclaim her existence and show herself in the full light of day.

This is the theory which has been put forward by Strauss in Germany, and in France by Littré, under the name of *Mythic Rationalism*. It goes without saying that in the eyes of these men, the supernatural facts, the miracles ascribed to Jesus Christ by the Sacred Books, are only myths, the figurative expression of purely intellectual conceptions.

In the first part of this work we have confuted this last assertion and proved by solid arguments, hitherto unanswered by modern infidels, the truth of the holy life, miracles and divinity of Christ, the Founder of Christianity.

We shall now overthrow the aforesaid mythical, irrational and historically groundless theory, by proving the following thesis (n. 302): We shall begin by explaining some of the terms employed in its exposition.

We mean by *society*, a body of men, uniting their individual energies for a common end to be attained by common means. Thus every properly organized society necessarily comprises an end to be attained, and members who endeavor to reach that end by the use of certain determined means.

The *special nature* of a society is determined above and before all by the *end* aimed at. A society may be literary,

scientific or commercial, according as the object aimed at by its members is the attainment of progress, either in letters or in science or in commercial pursuits. It is in view of the special purpose to be secured, that the members associate themselves together and determine the means, which they will employ to attain it.

Among the *elements of every society*, whose existence is intended to be permanent, one of the most essential is *authority*. In fact it is authority that forms and preserves the moral bond among the members composing it; it is authority that leads and directs the common action of the associates, urging them forward, moderating their activity, correcting their errors, as it may be deemed expedient for the good of each and all. Hence, in every society, authority is invested with certain prerogatives, determined by the end which is to be attained by its subordinates.

Therefore, to say that Jesus Christ has founded Christian society is to say that He united His disciples in a body, in order that they should pursue a common end (their eternal salvation), by common means (preaching, worship, the sacraments), and under an authority divinely established (members of the teaching and governing Church), constituted by Him. Let us prove in a few words that such is the case.

THESIS—JESUS CHRIST HAS REALLY AND PERSONALLY FOUNDED HIS RELIGION UNDER THE FORM OF A TRUE SOCIETY, A CHURCH.

302. FIRST ARGUMENT. We see in the Gospel: 1st. That Jesus Christ made a *formal promise* to institute a Church. Choosing among His twelve disciples Simon, to whom He gave the symbolic name of Peter, which means rock, He said to him: "Thou art Peter and upon this rock I will build my Church and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." (Matt. xvi, 18.) This promise alone is, in itself, already an amply sufficient proof, for Jesus Christ could not have failed to fulfill what He promised. In the same sacred record we read also; 2nd, that He has *fulfilled this promise* and founded His Church. In fact, He endowed His Apostles with *the same power* that He had re-

ceived from His Father. He gave them the power and the mission *to preach* His doctrine to every human creature, *to administer* the sacraments and *to govern* the Faithful, and He promised to be with them until the end of time. At the head of His Apostles He placed Simon on whom He conferred *universal jurisdiction* over the whole Church. (See nos. 359-366). Surely all this was really founding a religious society, a Church. 3d. The same Gospel and the Acts of the Apostles show us the disciples, after the Ascension, fulfilling the mission they had received; they preach the doctrine of Jesus Christ, they enact laws for the government of the Faithful, their subjects, they increase from day to day the number of their disciples, ruling and governing them under the direction of Peter, their supreme Head.

In this preliminary thesis we shall content ourselves with indicating the arguments; the developments, which they may require, will find their appropriate place in the theses that are to follow.

303. SECOND ARGUMENT, called the Argument of Prescription. The *very existence* of the Church proves her origin. As the existence for centuries of a people, of a civil society, proves the reality of its foundation, so the existence of the Church, that is to say, of that society distinct from all others, which has always borne the name of the Church of Christ, proves the reality of her institution. By its name, its worship, its temples, its sacraments, its ministers, its organization, its general and particular Councils, the uninterrupted succession of its legitimate pastors, its wonderful institutions, its moral and civilizing influence, this religious society, the Church, has not ceased, during nineteen centuries, to attest that it has been originally constituted by Jesus Christ.

304. REMARKS. The above argument gains new force, if we bear in mind the following observations:

1. He who speaks of religion, speaks of a concrete and living reality, *a society*, professing belief in religious dogmas and submission to moral principles, consequently a Church. It thence results that *the Christian religion* and

the Christian Church are *identically the same.* Hence, by the fact that Jesus Christ founded His *religion*, He also founded *His Church*, that is to say, the visible society of those who profess His doctrine.

2. The greater part of the proofs, by which we have established the divinity of the Christian religion, *directly* concern *the Church.* Thus it is Christianity *as forming a society, a Church*, which was foretold and described by the words of the prophets; it is the establishment of this Church which was divinely marked and sanctioned with the seal of miracles; it is her divine origin which was attested by the blood of martyrs; it is that Church that was miraculously founded and preserved, and has produced most wonderful fruits for the good of souls and the happiness of mankind.

305. Corollary. Peremptory Obligation on the Part of Man to Become a Member of this Church that he may be Saved. This indispensable duty is easily deduced from what precedes. There are in this world societies which are voluntary or optional; and unless constrained by obligations arising from special circumstances, no one is bound to belong to them. If a person agrees to assume the responsibility of membership, it is in order that he may be entitled to enjoy the advantages which these societies procure for their members. Such are financial companies and also religious orders. If, after joining any of these societies, a man is obliged to remain in it, it is because he cannot leave without violating rights, which he himself, of his own accord, had promised to maintain.

It is quite otherwise with the Christian society, the Church. Every man is under a strict obligation to enter it, for every man, as we have seen (no. 296), is obliged to profess Christianity. But Christianity is the same as the Church of Christ. We know, moreover, the formal injunction of Jesus Christ, the Founder of the Church: "Go, teach all nations, baptizing them. He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved; but he that believeth not, shall be condemned." (Mark xvi, 16.) This has always been

the Catholic belief, the belief of the fathers and the Councils. "Faith," said Pius IX, "teaches us that outside of the Apostolic Roman Church no one can be saved; she is the only ark of salvation; whosoever enters it not will be the victim of the deluge." We must observe, however, what we shall develop further on, that if without their fault some men are ignorant of the existence of the true Church and of the obligation to belong to her, they will not be punished for not entering it. We shall state in due time, under what conditions men may form part of the *soul* of the Church and attain heaven. (See further on, ch. iv, art. 4, "Out of the Church there is no Salvation.")

306. III. Purpose or End of the Church. The proper and *direct end* of the Church founded by Jesus Christ, or the purpose, which the Savior proposed to Himself in instituting her, is to lead men to eternal life. Nothing is more clear and evident than this in the Gospel and in every page of the New Testament. Moreover, neither in theory nor in practice has the Church ever attributed to herself any other end. History is there to attest it. The Church, it is true, has also invariably contributed to the temporal happiness of individuals and of States; but this is only an *indirect* effect, though a natural outcome of her doctrinal teaching.

With respect to this supernatural *end*, it can be said that the Church is a *spiritual* society, the society of souls. It is none the less true that the Church is *a visible and corporate* society. For, if it speaks to the soul, it is through the intermediary organs of the body; the means that she uses (preaching and the administering of the sacraments) are corporal and sensible means; the authority which governs her is a physical and tangible authority. Hence we can see how ridiculous is the sophism of *some* Protestants who say: the Church is the society of souls; therefore it is all spiritual, and they argue therefrom, that the Roman Church must be rejected, for the reason that she has a Pope, bishops, sacraments and religious ceremonies.

307. IV. Constitution of the Church or Ecclesias-

TICAL HIERARCHY. In every civil state or society there must be necessarily two orders of citizens—those who command and those who obey. There are likewise to be found in the Church two *constitutive elements*; those who teach and command, and those who listen and obey. The former constitute *the Church teaching* and *governing;* they are called pastors, the priesthood, the hierarchy; the latter form the *Church taught* and *governed*, and are called the Faithful or laity, the flock, the members of the fold.

In general three forms of government are to be found among men: the monarchic, the aristocratic, and the democratic.

1. Monarchy, or the rule of the single person, in whose hands the whole power of the State is concentrated.

2. Aristocracy, or the rule of the best, when the supreme power is vested in the principal persons of the State, or in a privileged order of citizens.

3. Democracy, or the rule of the people, when the governing power is exercised by the people through duly elected representatives. It is the monarchical form which the Church has received from her divine Founder. In fact, as we shall show further on, Peter was invested with the primacy, that is to say, the supreme power, which he was to transmit to his successors. But, as in a civil monarchy, there exist in the provinces heads or governors, subject and subordinate to the ruling sovereign; so in the ecclesiastical monarchy there is a Supreme and Only Head, who is the Pope, Vicar of Jesus Christ; and there are also in the various dioceses, subordinate chiefs, who are the Bishops. The Church is, therefore, by divine right, *a monarchy, wisely tempered by a kind of subordinate aristocracy.*

It is, therefore, an egregious mistake the attempt of most Protestants, who have endeavored to make of the Church a society of *equals.* According to their view, all ecclesiastical power resides in the multitude of the faithful. But as the people, as a whole, is incapable of exercising this power, they had to relieve themselves of this mission, by passing it over to delegates or mandatories; but, say

these Protestants, it is the Christian people who are to choose these delegates, to determine and limit their powers, and when they deem it advisable to pronounce the forfeiture of these powers, and depose those to whom they had entrusted them. It follows clearly from the simple reading of the Scriptures that such a system is absolutely contrary to the will of the Church's divine Founder. The proof shall be set forth further on.

308. V. The Church is a Complete or Perfect Society. A complete or perfect society is one that possesses *in itself* all the means necessary to attain its end. That a society be perfect it is necessary: 1st. That it should not enter as a part into any other society; thus, a financial corporation, which forms part of the State, and depends upon it, is incomplete. 2nd. That it should not have a purpose directly subordinate to that of another society; thus the military society or the army evidently has an end subordinate to that of civil society, in whose defense it has been organized. 3rd. That it should have in itself all the means for providing for its existence, preservation and the realization of its purpose. Now it can be proved that by the will of her divine Founder, the Church realizes all these conditions. We shall demonstrate it shortly. The Church is therefore a perfect society. In order to be convinced of this, it suffices to glance through history. During the first three centuries, the Church never ceased to pursue her purpose, which is the sanctification of souls. If she spread and firmly established herself, it was not only without the concurrence and help of the civil power, but in spite of most bitter persecution on its part (see n. 250). How, indeed, could the Church, a society of the *supernatural* order, receive of any society of a purely *natural order* the rights and resources necessary to attain its end? Supernatural means alone are proportionate to an end eminently supernatural, the eternal salvation of souls.

CHAPTER II.

The Roman Church is the True Church of Jesus Christ.

309. In the preceding chapter we have seen that Jesus Christ founded a Church, the religious society into which every man is obliged to enter, under penalty of missing his last end. We shall now enter into the principal question of this second part of our Course, directed to determine which among the societies, that bear the name of Christian, is the one that really has Jesus Christ as its Founder and preserves His doctrine in all its purity.

DIVISION. In the first article we shall set forth the distinctive marks, notes or characteristics, by which we may be enabled to recognize the true Church of Jesus Christ amidst the various Christian communities.

In the second article we shall show that the Catholic or Roman Church, whose head is the Bishop of Rome, possesses all these marks.

Article III and article IV will show that the other Christian denominations (Protestant or Schismatic) do not possess these marks. Let us observe, however, that this last proof is not indispensable; as there is only *one* Church of Jesus Christ, if the divinity of the Roman Catholic Church be once clearly established, the demonstration necessarily proclaims the falsity of all others, for truth is one and immutable.

Finally, in article V, we shall prove that St. Peter and his successors have received the supreme power or the Primacy, both of honor and jurisdiction, in the Church, and we shall draw from it an easy means of distinguishing the true Church from all the sects, which vainly attempt to usurp the title of the Church of Christ.

ART. I. THE MARKS OF THE TRUE CHURCH OF JESUS CHRIST.

310. The true religion, as we have seen, is obligatory for all men, and this true religion exists only in the Church founded by Jesus Christ. But God wills the salvation of all men (I Timothy ii, 1-4); it is, therefore, absolutely necessary that the true religion of Jesus Christ should at all times be recognized with certainty among the various religious societies that claim that honor. It is to render this recognition possible, easy and certain that the *marks* of the Church are needed.

Marks of the Church.

We shall treat I, of the marks in general; II, of the division of these marks; III, of the positive marks in particular.

I. Marks of the Church in General.

311. DEFINITION. We call marks of the Church certain characters, sensible, exclusive and permanent, by which the true Church of Christ can be recognized by all men in an easy and sure manner. Let us explain this definition.

1. *Sensible characters*, that is, exteriorily perceptible. Qualities that really exist, but which escape observation, evidently cannot assist us in discerning the true Church.

2. *Characters belonging to the Church alone*, and exclusively proper to the true Church of Christ. To use the words of the celebrated controversialist, Cardinal Bellarmin, "If I wish to designate and describe to you a man, whom you have never met, and enable you to know him at first sight, will it be enough for me to say: he has two hands, two ears, two eyes? By no means, for those are features and traits common to all men."

3. *Permanent characters*, that is, characters that subsist throughout all the ages of the Church. This is an immediate consequence of what we have previously said. As it is always and everywhere a strict obligation for men to enter the Church, the sole way of salvation, it is supremely important that everywhere and always they may be enabled to discern the way leading to salvation; it follows, there-

fore, that the characters which help in this discernment must be constant and permanent.

4. Lastly, *characters by which the true Church of Christ can be recognized by all men, in an easy and certain manner.* As all men are obliged to enter the Church, and as the greater number are incapable of making a serious examination and a profound study of the subject, the merciful Providence of God has disposed that it shall not be too difficult to discern the true Church by the assistance and application of these characters. (Isaias xxxv, 8.) It goes without saying, however, that each person perceives this demonstration more or less vividly according to the acuteness of his intellect; but the conviction of the learned man, whilst more enlightened and more deliberate, is none the less of the same nature as the conviction of the uneducated.

REMARK. It results, from what we have said, that among the prerogatives or endowments necessary to the Church, there are some that can serve in nowise as characters or marks. Such are the indefectibility and infallibility of the Church. For these are not outwardly perceptible nor more easily recognizable than the Church herself. Quite the contrary; for it is only after having *previously* discerned the true Church that we can say of her: the true Church must be indefectible, permanent and infallible in her teaching.

II. Division of the Marks or Characteristic Notes of the Church.

312. All the marks of the Church are qualities that are real, and characters that are positive. However, according to their value as proofs, they are usually divided into *positive* and *negative* marks. The *negative* marks or notes (if we may truly give them that name, for the above definition is not rigorously applicable to them,) are those marks, the *absence* of which proves evidently that a given society *is not* the Church of Jesus Christ, though their *presence* in a religious body does not prove by itself alone that the body possessing them is the true Church. We cite as examples certain marks generally advanced by Protestants, on behalf of some creed, such as perfect morality of its doctrine, sincerity

of its preachers, the right use of the sacraments, as well as just and peaceful methods employed in its propagation. These several characters are undoubtedly indispensable to the true Church; but besides the fact that they may, at least in theory, exist during a certain time in a dissident sect, they are practically as difficult to recognize as the Church herself.

On the contrary, the *positive* marks have quite a different value: these *belong exclusively* to the true Church of Christ. As soon as they are proven to exist in a religious society, we are justified in concluding unhesitatingly that *this society* is the true Church.

Apologists differ as to the enumeration of these marks, whether negative or positive. We shall speak only of the four marks generally admitted and enumerated in the Creed of Constantinople, which has been inserted in the liturgy of the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass. They are Unity, Sanctity, Catholicity, Apostolicity—Et unam, sanctam, Catholicam et Apostolicam Ecclesiam. This Creed, or symbol of faith, based on that of Nicea (A. D. 325), was drawn up by the Fathers of the first general council of Constantinople (A. D. 381), and contains an explicit confession of the divinity of the Holy Ghost, a truth which the heretic Macedonius denied.

III. Positive Marks.

A. First Positive Mark—Unity.

313. This unity is twofold; it comprises: 1. Unity of *doctrine* and faith, which consists in the common accord of all the Faithful in admitting and believing all that the teaching Church proposes to them as revealed or confirmed by Jesus Christ. 2. Unity of *government*, which produces unity of *communion*, and which consists in the submission of all the faithful to their respective bishops, and in particular to the Roman Pontiff, supreme Head of the Church. To break the unity of faith, by rejecting even only one point of doctrine, constitutes heresy; to break the unity of government, by rejecting the authority of the legitimate heads, produces schism.

I. UNITY OF DOCTRINE AND BELIEF.

THESIS—JESUS CHRIST INTENDED THAT HIS CHURCH SHOULD HAVE UNITY OF DOCTRINE AND BELIEF, THAT IS TO SAY, HE ENJOINED IT AS AN OBLIGATION UPON PASTORS TO TEACH, AND AS A CONSEQUENCE, UPON THE FAITHFUL TO BELIEVE ALL THE TRUTHS REVEALED BY HIM, WITHOUT EITHER ADDITION OR DIMINUTION. (See Apocalypse, ch. xxii, v. 18, 19.)

314. FIRST ARGUMENT, taken from the Holy Scriptures. (*a*) "Go ye therefore," said Jesus to His Apostles, "teach ye all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, and teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." (Matth. xxviii, 19, 20.) Jesus here makes no exception; He even *excludes* exceptions by the emphasis which He places upon His words: "You shall teach them," He says, "to *observe all things whatsoever* I have commanded you." He thus enjoins faith in the *whole* doctrine, as well as obedience to *all* His commandments. Again He says: "Preach the Gospel to every creature; he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be condemned." (Mark xvi, 16.) If it were enough to believe and admit only a few truths, and we were free to accept or reject the others, Jesus Christ would necessarily have said so, because, as He Himself decides, it is a question of either salvation or of damnation, according to the observance or the transgression of His commands. Nor does Jesus make any exception when He says: "He that heareth you heareth me; he that despiseth you, despiseth Me." (Luke x, 16.) And in another place, speaking of a rebellious subject, He says: "If he will not hear the Church, let him be to thee as a heathen and a publican." (Matth. xviii, 19.)

b. The Apostles hold the same language as their Master. There is not to be found in the Epistles of St. Paul a single word which suggests the slightest distinction between one dogma and another, one truth and another, as if one could be admitted and the other rejected. The Apostle announces the doctrine of Jesus Christ, nothing more and nothing less. He anathematizes any one who would preach anything else, even if it were himself or an angel

come down from heaven. "But though we, or an Angel from Heaven, preach a gospel to you beside that which we have preached to you, let him be anathema." (Gal. i, 8.) He begs of the Romans to keep away from those who sow dissension and scandals against the doctrine which they have learned. (Rom. xvi, 17.) He implores the Corinthians to have all one and the same language, not to suffer schism in their midst (I Cor. i, 10); he condemns old schisms and heresies without distinction, under pain of damnation. St. John speaks in the same way. According to him, "who ever recedeth and continueth not in the doctrine of Christ, hath not God." He adds: "If any man come to you and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into the house, nor say to him, God save you." (II John v, 9, 10.)

315. SECOND ARGUMENT taken from the teachings of the early Fathers of the Church and the ancient Councils.

(*a*) Driven to the wall by the unanswerable arguments of Catholic theologians, the French Calvinist Jurieu, introduced, during the XVII century, into the doctrine of Jesus Christ, a distinction absolutely unknown before his time. He made a distinction between *fundamental* articles, which men are obliged to believe, and *non fundamental* articles, which they are free to reject. This division, according to his contention, was generally admitted during the first four centuries of the Church. It was only about the Vth century that this distinction was suppressed and that the Faithful found themselves thenceforward obliged to believe without distinction all the dogmas revealed by Jesus Christ.[1] In any case, the system of *fundamentals* is fatal to the cause of

[1] We do not believe it necessary to devote much space to refuting this distinction, invented for the purpose of defending a desperate cause, and eagerly adopted by all the Protestants of that time. It would be easy to show that this system, now generally abandoned, is formally opposed to Sacred Scriptures, on which, however, Protestants claim to ground their belief exclusively; that it completely destroys the authority of Jesus Christ; that it is opposed to the belief of all Christians up to the XVII century; finally that it is altogether arbitrary and absolutely impracticable. How will Protestants decide what articles are to be held as fundamental, when they acknowledge in the interpretation of the Word of God no other rule than private judgment and individual reason? If, as Jurieu would have it, the surest rule is to admit as fundamental and necessary for

Protestantism, in whose support it was devised. For either it is true, or it is false; if it is true, then, as the Catholic Church holds and always did hold, the fundamentals (for there is no doctrine called fundamental by Protestants but what is believed by the Catholic Church), it was an inconsistent and wicked act to separate from her; and it is a most dangerous act to remain in open schism with that Church, who, avowedly holding the essential truths of salvation, holds also that *out of her pale there is no salvation.* If, on the contrary, that system is false, then Protestantism is also false, by the very fact that it was the first to invent it and to embrace it.

It is quite evident, if such a change in doctrine had taken place at that time, it would have brought on numberless protests, from the Fathers and bishops, as well as from the Faithful and from the heretics themselves. We know the unremitting vigilance ever displayed by the Church to preserve purity and integrity of doctrine; the numberless Councils, general and particular, assembled to treat of dogmatic questions, abundantly testify to this unceasing vigilance. The history of these times, which speaks even of the less important heresies with great care and many details, tells of no protestations or reproaches. And what is still more striking, no Catholic, no heretic, and even no Protestant before Jurieu ever noticed any such innovation, no one ever dreamt of making it a matter of reproach against the Church. This is because in reality the Church has never varied on that point, and consequently all tradition condemns this theory.

(*b*) Moreover, it is absolutely false that the Fathers and

salvation only that which Christians have unanimously thought and still think to be such, the surest rule would be to have no longer any belief at all in religious matters, for is there a single dogma which has not been rejected by one set of heretics or another? And again, this distinction reacts against Protestants themselves and condemns their separation from the Catholic Church In fact, as the Church, even according to their admission, has always professed and still professes the articles that they declare fundamental, what motives could they have to justify their separation from her? Why do we still see them in our day flinging against the Roman Church and the Bishop of Rome their invectives and their calumnies?

the bishops of the *first four centuries* have taught the distinction discovered by Jurieu at so remote a date. On the contrary, when they speak of the teachings of the Gospel and the obligation to believe in them, they always do so in *universal terms*, which *imply no restrictions*. According to them, that which must be taught, that which must be believed, is *the doctrine of Christ*; he who teaches otherwise is a heretic, and the man who believes in his words, participates in his heresy; and they are, both of them, excluded from the communion of the Church, and consequently from salvation. These Fathers and these Bishops, teaching and professing such unchangeable doctrine, even if taken alone, without reference to Councils, are quite numerous; Cardinal Gousset, in his Dogmatic Theology, reproduces the testimony of twenty-one of them, from St. Ignatius of Antioch and St. Polycarp of Smyrna, disciples of the Apostles, to St. Basil, St. Gregory Nazianzen and St. Ambrose. We should not fail to notice that all these Fathers and Doctors lived before the V. century.

316. THIRD ARGUMENT, taken from reason. Common sense alone should tell us that when the fact of divine Christian revelation is once admitted, it cannot be a matter of indifference to believe that there are seven sacraments or less than seven; that confession is necessary for the forgiveness of sins or that it is not; that Jesus Christ is really present in the Holy Eucharist or that He is there only figuratively. Can any one seriously believe that he who adores the consecrated Host and he who tramples it under foot, are equally agreeable to God, and true disciples of Jesus Christ? Can it be permissible to believe that one can save his soul without adding good works to faith? Is it not evident that religions, which profess doctrines so opposed to each other, cannot all be true? Is it not evident that there can be only *one and the same religion*, teaching the one and indivisible doctrine of Jesus Christ? And yet Protestantism maintains that Religious Truth, viz., Divine Revelation, is compatible with the profession of opposite creeds, thus putting itself in contradiction with common sense.

II. UNITY OF GOVERNMENT OR OF MINISTRY.

317. Jesus Christ has enjoyed unity of government no less than unity of doctrine.

This is *a question of fact;* in commanding the Pope and the Bishops to announce the truth, which He brought into the world, Jesus Christ also confided to them the dispensing of the sacraments, the ordering of worship, and all that concerns the government of the Faithful.

OBSERVATION. There are Protestants who acknowledge and admit some kind of power in their ministers. But, in the first place, according to them, the authority with which these ministers are invested in nowise binds the Faithful; for they ascribe to each Christian individually a right to form in the last resort, his own opinion on religious questions, to decide what he will believe and what he will reject. Moreover, this power, far from being confided to the Bishops, united and subject to the Roman Pontiff, is, according to them, rightfully exercised by each pastor whom the Faithful may acknowledge as such; on condition, however, that in the preaching office and the administration of the sacraments, he do not reject any of the so-called fundamental articles.

As to the Schismatic Greeks, they deny, it is well known, *the primacy of jurisdiction of the Bishop of Rome* in the exercise of the ministry, and consequently, the obligation for Bishops and their flock to form part of the Roman communion.

THESIS.—JESUS CHRIST HAS CONSTITUTED IN HIS CHURCH AN AUTHORITY, WHICH HE CONFIDED TO HIS APOSTLES, AND ESPECIALLY TO PETER, AND TO WHICH ALL THE FAITHFUL MUST SUBMIT; CONSEQUENTLY, WHOSOEVER SEPARATES HIMSELF FROM THEM, REFUSING OBEDIENCE IN MATTERS PERTAINING TO THE EXERCISE OF THEIR MINISTRY, GOES OUT FROM THE TRUE CHURCH BY THE WAY OF SCHISM, JUST AS THE INNOVATOR IN MATTERS OF DOCTRINE GOES OUT FROM THE CHURCH BY THE WAY OF HERESY.

318. ARGUMENT, drawn from Scripture. (*a*) Jesus explicitly declared that He sent His Apostles as His Father had sent Him; He commanded them to preach the Gospel, administer baptism, and teach all things that He had taught

them Himself, promising to remain with them forever. As we will prove further on in a separate article, He specially named Peter as Supreme Head and foundation of His Church; He gave him the keys of the kingdom of heaven; He explicitly commanded him to feed all His flock, the sheep, that is, the pastors, as well as the lambs, or the Faithful, and He promised to ratify all the decisions of Peter. One day, speaking to the Apostles and the Disciples, whom He had associated with them, Jesus gave to them practical teachings of high importance, among which there is one which immediately concerns the present question: "If thy brother shall offend thee," He said, "go and reprove him between thee and him alone. If he shall hear thee, thou shalt gain thy brother. And if he will not hear thee, take with thee one or two more, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may stand. And if he will not hear them, tell the Church. And if he will not hear the Church, let him be to thee as the heathen and the publican." (Matth. xviii, 15, 16, 17.) It would be easy to show that the witnesses, of whom Jesus speaks, should not be called for the purpose of pronouncing judgment, but simply to uphold, by their presence, the reclamations of him who is offended. Moreover, the words of the Master, which follow immediately those we have just cited, do not allow the slightest doubt as to the power confided to His Apostles: "Amen, I say to you, whatsoever you shall bind upon earth, shall be bound also in heaven; and whatsoever you shall loose upon earth shall be loosed also in heaven." (Matth. xviii, 18, 19.) These words, which previously had been said to Peter alone, are now addressed to all the Apostles whom Jesus Christ associated with him in the government of the Church, and this without detriment to the primacy already instituted. Moreover, we must carefully notice, it is not a question of faith that is referred to here, but a question of spiritual direction, the reparation of an injury done by a brother to a brother. And yet Jesus says in *formal terms* that if the culprit refuse to *submit* to the Church, he should be considered as a heathen and a publican, that is, as belonging no longer to the Church. There ex-

ists, therefore, in the Church a governing authority established by the Saviour, to which all the faithful must submit, *under pain of being separated from the Church.*

(*b*) The same ministry is insisted upon by St. Paul in many of his epistles. He writes to the Ephesians: "And some, indeed, He (Christ) gave to be Apostles, and some prophets, and others evangelists, and others pastors and teachers, for the perfection of the saints, for the work of the ministry, unto the edification of the body of Christ, till we all meet in unity of faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God; . . . that we may not now be children, tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine." (Ephes. iv, 11, 12, 13, 14.) He recommends to the Galatians union, concord and subordination, placing *schisms*, which he calls sects, on the same level as the works of the flesh, *which exclude from the kingdom of heaven.* In another place, he commands the Bishops, who, he says, "are *appointed by the Holy Ghost to govern* the Church of God (Acts xx, 28), to take heed to the whole flock, over which the Holy Ghost has placed you bishops, to rule the Church of God, which He hath purchased with His own blood, for I know that, after my departure, ravening wolves will enter in among you, not sparing the flock, and of your own selves will arise men speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them." (Acts xx, 28.)

Surely, this is a ministry clearly defined; *in its origin*, which is the will of God; *in its depositaries*, who are the heads of the Church, and more particularly Peter; and *in its object*, which is the preservation of the Faithful in the unity of the faith. Now, if the Faithful were not obliged to submit to this authority, for what purpose does it exist, and why, in case of refusal, should men be excluded from the kingdom of heaven?

We could draw a no less conclusive proof from *the teaching of the Fathers*, and in particular from the admirable letter, which St. Clement, disciple and companion of the great Apostle St. Paul, wrote to the Corinthians for the purpose of appeasing a schism which had just broken out among

them. This letter enjoyed exceptional authority, so much so that for a long time it was read in the Eastern Churches with the books of the Scriptures themselves. It may be found in Gousset and in the Conferences of Father Olivier, and also in many authentic quotations found in the works of St. Ignatius, St. Irenaeus, St. Cyprian, and others.

B. Second Mark—Sanctity.

319. Before considering sanctity as a note or mark, thus enabling us to recognize the true Church, we shall speak of it at first in a more general way, and refute an error of the Protestants concerning the question at issue.

I. THE SANCTITY OF THE CHURCH IN GENERAL.

If we were satisfied with vague and general terms, we might say that Protestants, as well as Catholics, acknowledge sanctity as a quality or property necessary to the Church. According to them, as well as to us, Jesus wished that His Church should be saintly, and He founded her for no other purpose than the sanctification of men. It would be difficult for them to contest this point. St. Paul is most emphatic in his language. Writing to the Ephesians he speaks thus: "Christ loved the Church, and delivered Himself up for it that He might sanctify it, cleansing it by the laver of water in the word of life. That He might present it to Himself, a glorious Church, not having spot or wrinkle, nor any such thing, but that it shall be holy and without blemish." (Eph. v, 25, 26, 27.)

But when the question arises as to what constitutes this sanctity, Protestants, some by excess, others by default, fall into two errors directly opposed to each other. The former, confounding the sanctity of the Church with the sanctity of each of her members, claim that the just alone, who are known to none but God, form part of the Church of Christ.

The others, as we said, sin by default. They are satisfied with an ordinary and common-place sanctity, shared by all the members of the Church, and reject as foreign to the spirit of the Gospel everything that savors of heroism and perfection, and in particular the religious life and vows.

Above all, they will not hear of miracles performed in confirmation of eminent sanctity.

Catholic truth, as in many other instances, is found midway between these two extremes; thus it is, what we call, the golden mean.

This is, in brief, her teaching on the subject: The Church is holy because its *Author* is holy and the very source of holiness; because her *object* is the sanctification of men; because the means which she uses, her dogma, her moral doctrine, her sacraments, are holy in themselves and lead to holiness; because, at all times, *many of her members* have been distinguished for their sanctity, some of them—those who have fully followed her directions—have even become conspicuous by *eminent* sanctity; finally, because true miracles have been performed to manifest and confirm this sanctity. But before proceeding let us establish the following thesis:

THESIS.—THE CHURCH OF JESUS CHRIST IS NOT EXCLUSIVELY COMPOSED OF MEN JUST BEFORE GOD.

320. FIRST ARGUMENT, derived from the teaching of Jesus Christ. The figures, under which Jesus Christ represents His Church, show her as invariably composed of just men and of sinners. She contains the wheat and the chaff, the faithful servant and the unfaithful, the prudent and the foolish virgins, the sterile fig tree preserved near the fruitful ones; she is a field of tares mingled with the good seed until the harvest day; a net thrown into the sea and bringing in all kinds of fish, good and bad, the good to be kept, the bad to be rejected.

SECOND ARGUMENT, taken from the conduct of the Apostles. It was in this sense that the Apostles taught by Jesus understood the matter. We see them, it is true, recalling to duty those Christians whose conduct was not in keeping with their Faith; but they are far from treating them as strangers to the Church. Because St. Paul separates from the communion of the Church the scandalous sinner of Corinth, and ratifies the excommunication and expulsion of the two heretics, Hymeneus and Alexander, already excluded

by the very fact of their public and notorious heresy (I Cor. V; I Tim. i, 20), the Apostle does not therefore consider as banished from the Church other sinners, whom he does not cut off from the communion of the faithful.

II. THE SANCTITY OF THE CHURCH CONSIDERED AS A MARK OF TRUTH.

321. We have seen that the Church is holy in many ways and under several aspects. These different kinds of holiness are not all equally helpful in the discernment of the true Church. Some are not easy to discover, and consequently cannot serve as marks of the true Church of Christ; others could only serve as negative marks.

The holiness which is available more particularly as a positive mark of the Church is the sanctity of her members, and especially the extraordinary and *heroic* sanctity of some of her members. This characteristic is easily perceived, for eminent sanctity must naturally manifest itself, at least from time to time, by extraordinary outward works. Moreover, this holiness is at times confirmed by astounding miracles.

The gift of miracles, in fact, belongs to the true Church, as her own exclusive privilege; it is not an accidental and transitory thing; it is the fulfilling of promises repeatedly made by Jesus Christ, and which were not limited to any particular time. "He that believeth in Me," says the Saviour, "the works that I do, he shall do also, and greater than these shall he do." (John xiv, 12.) And He also says: "These signs shall follow them that believe; in my name they shall cast out devils; they shall speak with new tongues; they shall take up serpents, and if they shall drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them; they shall lay their hands upon the sick, and they shall recover." (Mark xvi, 17, 18.) Therefore, if miracles were no longer required to prove the divinity of the Christian religion, they would still be necessary to fulfill the promise of Jesus Christ.

C. Third Mark—Catholicity.

322. Catholic means universal. By applying the word to the Church of Jesus Christ is meant that at all the epochs of her existence, after a sufficient diffusion of the Gospel,

the Church should *be morally spread*, everywhere the *same*, and without any change, *throughout the whole word.*

We say *everywhere the same*, for true Catholicity supposes unity of doctrine and government; without this the Church that exists in China, for instance, would not be the same as that which exists in Brazil, and it would be false to say: this Church is at the same time in Brazil and in China. A union of sects that would have nothing in common but a name, and such, no one can but know, is the case with Protestantism, would not deserve the name of Catholic or universal religion, even if this union were spread throughout the world by the various elements or sects composing it. A heap of loose stones, no matter how large, cannot be called a building.

Catholicity may be considered either absolutely, in itself, or relatively, by comparison with dissenting sects.

(*a*) Taken in an *absolute* sense, Catholicity does not require that the Church should exist simultaneously in all parts of the world, without any exception, much less that she should embrace the universality of mankind. St. Matthew says that when the Gospel shall have been preached to all the nations, the end of the world shall be at hand. And Jesus, answering, said: ". . . This Gospel of the Kingdom shall be preached in the whole world, for a testimony to all nations: and then shall the consummation come." (Matth. xxiv, 4, 14.) Here then we only speak of a *moral* universality. That the Church should deserve the name of Catholic, it is sufficient that she should contain a great number of members, and that she should exist in most of the known parts of the earth, so that she may from these easily spread to other countries. "It is necessary," says an illustrious theologian, Suarez, "that the Church should spread over the world a certain universal splendor, so that her light may reach out everywhere, and men may be enabled to distinguish her from all the heretical sects." The Scriptures properly understood and tradition from the first ages require only this moral universality.

(*b*) If Catholicity be considered *relatively*, *viz.*, as compared with the dissenting sects, it is not necessary that the

Church be more numerous than all the other Christian communities taken together, but it is enough that it surpass in numbers each of the sects taken separately, viz., according to the number of adherents to each separate creed.

THESIS.—Catholicity is a necessary characteristic Mark of the true Church.

323. Proof taken from Scripture. (*a*) In the first place it is certain that the prophecies concerning the Messiah and His work, many of which have been already quoted (n. 233), represent the Church as destined to spread herself all over the world. She shall be the light of nations, the light that shall shine as far as the extremities of the earth; the house of the Lord, in which all nations shall be assembled; a high mountain, which will fill all the earth. The Messiah shall have the nations for His inheritance, and for His possession the extremities of the earth. All the kings of the earth shall adore Him, and all the nations obey Him. From dawn to eventide His name shall be adored by all the nations, and in all places a pure oblation and sacrifice shall be offered in His name. These passages and many others, which it would be too long to recall (n. 233, 234), are inexplicable, if they do not signify the moral spreading of the Church of Christ over all the earth.

(*b*) Moreover, the words of Jesus Himself are no less explicit. He ordered His disciples to preach the Gospel to every creature, to instruct all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, and teaching them to observe all things that He had commanded them. He sends them to be witnesses unto Him at Jerusalem, in Judea, in Samaria, and to the uttermost extremities of the world.

(*c*) *The Apostles* understood perfectly well the purpose of their Master. Faithful to His commands, they preach the Gospel at first in Judea and Samaria, then they disperse among heathen nations, and soon St. Paul can truthfully write to the Romans that their faith is preached throughout the world; and to the Colossians that the Gospel has spread all over the earth. The Apostles, therefore, knew full well

that the Catholicity of the Church was willed by Jesus Christ, and that it is one of her essential properties. Hence they have included in the Apostolic creed this article of faith: "I believe in the Holy *Catholic* Church."

The reader will find on this subject many testimonies of the Fathers cited in the theological works of Gousset and in the Conferences of Father Olivier. See also the excellent work in three volumes of Father Waterworth, "The Faith of Catholics confirmed by Scripture and attested by the Fathers of the first five centuries of the Church." American edition, Pustet & Co., New York, 1885. Vol. II, article entitled "The Church Catholic or Universal," where are to be found hundreds of quotations covering nearly twenty pages.

THIS CATHOLICITY IS A MARK, which serves to distinguish the true Church, for it offers us *an easy means* of recognizing the true Church: it is not difficult to ascertain the fact that among Christian societies it is the only one of which it can be said that it is morally spread all over the earth, from the time that the Gospel was sufficiently promulgated, and that it includes in its fold the greatest number of members professing the same Faith, partaking of the same sacraments, and participating in the same worship, under the direction of the same legitimate pastors.

REMARK. It must not be forgotten that all the marks of the Church, and Catholicity in particular, serve to distinguish the true Church from *other Christian societies*. It is by following another line of arguments that we have proven, in the first part, the exclusive divinity of the Christian religion, as opposed to all other forms of un-Christian belief.

D. Fourth Mark—Apostolicity.

324. In saying that the true Church is necessarily Apostolic, we mean in the first place that she must profess the doctrine taught by the Apostles: this is apostolicity of doctrine. Secondly, she must be able to trace back to the Apostles the unbroken succession of the legitimate heads: this is apostolicity of the ministry or of government.

Apostolicity of *doctrine* is a logically indispensable conse-

quence of the *unity* required in the true Church, and indeed, its necessity is not denied; but this property is of little use as a *mark*, as a positive means of discerning the true Church. It is, therefore, the Apostolicity of the ministry that here concerns us most. But we have proven (nn. 302 and 318) that authority in the Church was really confided to the Apostles. It now remains to show that this authority was to be transmitted, without interruption, to their legitimate successors. Apostolicity then is the mark which reason would absolutely require that the true Church should display, and the absence of which it would deem fatal to her claims, even if she were to possess the other three. What a judge would say to a man, who claimed to be heir-at-law to some title or estate, the same can reason fairly say to the church claiming to be the true Church of Christ: "Show and prove your pedigree." The ruling, teaching and sanctifying powers of the true Church must, of course, have been transmitted by the Apostles, who originally received them from Christ, to successors, and these in turn must have handed them down to others. The church that cannot trace her pedigree back to the Apostles, through an unbroken succession of pastors, cannot be the true Church; hence the necessity of firmly establishing the following

THESIS.—JESUS CHRIST WISHED AND DISPOSED THAT THE POWERS, WHICH HE CONFIDED TO HIS APOSTLES, SHOULD BE TRANSMITTED BY THEM TO THEIR SUCCESSORS UNTIL THE END OF TIME.

325. FIRST ARGUMENT. (*a*) This thesis flows from the very *purpose* which the Saviour had in view in investing His Apostles with the authority He held from His Father, which was to bring to salvation all men *until the end of time*. "As the Father hath sent Me, I also send you." (John xx, 21.) "You have not chosen me, but I have chosen you, and have appointed you, that you should go and should bring forth fruit, and your fruit should remain." (John xv, 16.) As wise as He was powerful, the divine Master could not fail to provide the means of attaining the end He had in view. As His Apostles were to die in the course of time, His will

evidently was that their ministry should pass to their legitimate successors, considered as forming with them a single moral person. And it is in this sense that we must understand the promise of perennial assistance implied in the words addressed by Christ to His first Apostles: "Behold, I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world." (Matth. xxviii, 20.)

(*b*) Jesus Christ *assures* them that His Church will last as long as the world. But a society cannot exist without authority, which is its basis. This authority must be perpetuated forever in the Church; and since it was the Apostles who received the necessary powers, it was to *them alone* that the right belonged to transmit these powers to those whom they might choose, and for the latter in their turn to transmit them to others until the end of the world.

Second Argument. We learn from history that the Apostles have really transmitted to others the powers which they received from Jesus Christ, for they appointed everywhere Bishops to replace them and to succeed them. Thus St. Paul appoints Timothy Bishop of Ephesus and Titus Bishop of Crete, charging them to guard the deposit of faith and to perpetuate their ministry by appointing other pastors. (Titus i, 5.)

Third Argument. Tradition. That an apostolic succession is essential for the discernment of the true Church the Fathers unanimously teach. A few quotations will suffice. St. Irinaeus, Bishop of Lyons (A. D. 177), after enumerating the Bishops of Rome, who had succeeded each other from St. Peter, adds: "By this order and by this succession the preaching of the truth which is in the Church has come down to us from the Apostles; and this is a most complete demonstration that the life-giving Faith is one and the same, which from the Apostles even until now has been preserved in the Church and transmitted in truthfulness." (Adv. Haeres. iii, 3.) Tertullian (A. D. 380) writes of such heretical and schismatical churches as pretended to be the true Church of Christ: "Let them unroll the line of their Bishops, so coming down by succession from the beginning,

that their first Bishop had for his consecrator and predecessor some one of the Apostles, or Apostolic men. Let the heretics exhibit something of the same sort." (De Praescript.) St. Augustine (A. D. 400) says explicitly: "What keeps me in the Catholic Church is an authority begun with miracles. . . . strengthened by antiquity; it is the *succession of Bishops and Priests* from the very chair of Peter (to whom the Lord committed the sheep to be fed) down to even my present Bishop." (Contr. Ep. Fund., Manich.)

326. REMARK. The authority with which Jesus Christ invested His Apostles comprised a two-fold power: The power of *Orders* and the power of *jurisdiction*. The first, which regards the administration of the sacraments, and which cannot be *lost*, is conferred by *ordination*. The Bishops alone possess it in its fullness, and therefore there is no priestly office, which they may not exercise; to them alone belongs the power of conferring upon others the sacred character, which they have themselves received. Should a Bishop become a schismatic or a heretic, he could ordain, *validly* but *not legitimately*, bishops and priests. The power of jurisdiction requires *canonical institution*, or a definite or authoritative nomination, and it can be withdrawn by the legitimate heads of the Church. This power of jurisdiction comprises, at the same time, the faculty of exercising *legitimately*, the power of Orders, and the *right* to take part in the *government* of the Church.

To belong to the legitimate line of the Pastors of the Church, or to the hierarchy of jurisdiction, it is not enough that a Bishop should have received the power of Orders; he must have received besides the mission or authorization to govern a diocese. This statement, which we can deduce from the words of all the Fathers, condemning as schismatics bishops occupying usurped sees, is moreover evident enough by itself. The Episcopate is founded for the government of the Church, and the Bishop is chief and ruler in the Church. He must therefore have subjects on whom to exercise his authority or governing power. But *one cannot give himself subjects*. Jesus alone, Who had received from

His Father the nations as an inheritance, could confide to those whomsoever He might choose the power to govern the Faithful, that is to say, the power of *jurisdiction*. He confided it to the Apostles, and principally to Peter, their head, with the mission to transmit it to their successors. As to the mode of transmission, which was not determined by Jesus Christ Himself, it is for the heads of the Church to prescribe it.

This *mode* or *method* may have varied in the course of time, especially as to the appointments of the persons, who were to receive jurisdiction. Without ever prejudicing the essential right of free nomination, which the Vicar of Christ possesses for all dignities inferior to his own, it has happened that at times these persons were designated by election, at others by presentation, sometimes the simple will of the successor of Peter has alone sufficed.

As it was the Church, and not Jesus Christ, that determined the canonical rules to be observed in this transmission, the Church has the right to *modify* them according to circumstances. But the jurisdiction itself dwells at all times in the heads of the Church, and is always transmitted according to the canonical rules in force at the time. Whosoever, therefore, has not received jurisdiction, *according to those rules*, saving the imprescriptible right of the Sovereign Pastor, remains without it; and even if he should have received the episcopal character, he does not belong *to the hierarchy of jurisdiction*. Having no see and no subjects, it is evident that he is not a *chief* in the Church, and that he does not belong *to the Apostolic succession*.

327. REMARKS. 1. Bishops have the same functions and the same powers as the Apostles had. There are, however, some special privileges which the Apostles alone enjoyed as *founders* of the Church, and which they did not transmit to their successors; these are personal infallibility in the teaching of the doctrine of Jesus Christ, the right to preach their faith *everywhere* and to govern the faithful; to erect bishoprics on their own authority.

2. The two powers of order and jurisdiction are com-

municated to priests, but only in part and for the purpose of certain acts, for instance, for sacramental absolution. But this important subject calls for further development.

"The power of Order gives capacity; the power of jurisdiction permits the use of authority. The distinction between 'can' and 'may,' the former expressing power *inherent* (to Order), the latter power *dependent* (on jurisdiction), affords a good illustration of the subject. The dispenser of the power of Order is but an instrument; the grantor of the power of jurisdiction exercises authority and dominion. The first coming directly from Christ is abiding and unchangeable. It is conferred in equal measure on each priest and bishop as to the power of consecration. The second not coming immediately, but through the Church, from Christ to individuals, is conferred in varying proportions, as may be deemed expedient for the good of souls.

In the instances mentioned above (n. 325, 2d Argument), Timothy and Titus had neither more nor less of episcopal character than had any of the Apostles; as bishops they were equal. But the Apostles had *universal* jurisdiction directly from Christ. Timothy and Titus received their commission from the Apostles; it was restricted to the Church at Ephesus, and to the Church in Crete; it was neither sovereign nor independent.

Timothy and Titus were consecrated bishops, but the Episcopate of Authority, of which they were appointed participators, was one, indivisible, sovereign and independent. It was given first in its fullness to Peter *separately*; later the power of binding and loosing was given *collectively* to the Apostolic College. Thus did Jesus Christ establish two indestructible elements in the organization of the Church:

(1.) The Apostolate, consisting in universal jurisdiction derived directly from Christ.

(2.) The one Episcopate, founded immediately by Christ, and exercising corporate jurisdiction in the whole world.

The first resides in the successor of St. Peter, who is therefore the Supreme Governor, the Supreme Teacher of the Church, with whom there must be communion in order to be in the visible Organic Body, the Fold of Christ.

The second resides in the Body of Bishops, conjointly, who thus together represent the Apostolic College; but to have part in this Episcopate the individual must be appointed by the Head of the Church; or by the Head with the Episcopate.

In this way has every Bishop proper and ordinary jurisdiction in his diocese, and yet is not sovereign and independent. Therefore not by delegated or vicarious power, but by the Holy Ghost, do Bishops rule in the Church of God, as the successors not of individual Apostles, but of the Apostolic College. "The Holy Ghost hath placed you Bishops to rule the Church of God." Address of St. Paul to the clergy of Ephesus. (Acts xx, 28.)" (From *The Catholic Church*, by Monsignor Capel.) As Cardinal Hergenrother has it in *Church and State*, vol. 1, p. 177: "The Episcopal power of jurisdiction is therefore not derived 'immediately from Christ,' in so far it exists in individuals; it has been established by Christ, but is not conferred immediately by Him upon individual bishops; it is imparted to them by the Head of the Church, or by Bishops He has authorized. Thus the unity of the Episcopate, so much insisted on by the Fathers, is fully upheld; the Holy See is head, root, spring and origin of the spiritual authority."

St. Thomas Aquinas, the Prince of Theologians, who died in 1274, that is, fully two centuries previous to the so-called Reformation, expresses with much precision the distinction between Order and Jurisdiction. (2, 2, 30, n. 2:)

"Although schismatics have the power of Order, yet they are deprived of the authority of Jurisdiction.

"Spiritual power is two-fold—the one Sacramental, the other Jurisdictional. Sacramental is that which is conferred by some consecration. But all consecrations of the Church are permanent, so long as the matter remains which is consecrated, this even in things inanimate—an altar once consecrated cannot be reconsecrated, unless it be afterwards broken. And, therefore, this power remains as to its essence in a man who has received it by consecration so long as he lives, whether he fall into schism or heresy. But as

inferior power ought not to be brought into action unless it be moved by superior power, as is seen in nature, it follows that those (who fall into schism or heresy) lose the use of the power, and it is not lawful for them to use it. If, nevertheless, they do so, their power produces its effect in sacraments, for in these man is but the instrument of God. Hence the effects of sacraments are not prevented on account of any guilt in the minister of the sacraments.

"But Jurisdictional Power is that which is conferred by the simple concession of man; such power does not inhere permanently; whence such power does not remain with schismatics and heretics; they, therefore, are unable to absolve, to excommunicate, to grant indulgences and the like. Should they do so, the acts would be null and void.

"When, therefore, it is said that schismatics and heretics have not spiritual power, it is to be understood of Jurisdiction; but if Power of Order be referred to, then is not meant its essence, but its legitimate use.

Remark. Here validity of sacred Orders is evidently supposed; for should it be wanting, then there would be neither Power of Order, nor of Jurisdiction, as it is the case with Anglicans, and, in fact, with all modern Protestant sects.

To this clear statement of St. Thomas may be added the still more explicit teaching of Suarez on the way of receiving Papal and Episcopal jurisdiction:

"The pontifical power is, as it were, the primal example of all spiritual power of jurisdiction; for no one will deny that that is a true power of active jurisdiction—nay, in that order, is the highest that can exist in mere man. Now that power is *not* given to the Pontiff by any consecration, but by *election* and the bare grant of God; for when He said to Peter 'Feed My Sheep,' He impressed upon him no new consecration or character, but gave him a mere power of jurisdiction. So, too, the Pope, *when rightly elected*, is immediately true Pope as to such power, and as to that he receives no consecration; nay, if not already a bishop or a priest, he must be afterwards consecrated or even ordained, and, nevertheless, in the meantime, he can exercise *all acts*

of mere external jurisdiction. Therefore, in the same manner, the proper power of jurisdiction is granted to other bishops by *election* or *simple concession*, not by consecration, for the principle is the same, not only because the episcopal power is but a certain participation of the papal power, but likewise because, as in the appointment of the Pope, to apply to him, matter or subjects (for the exercise of his jurisdiction) is nothing else but to give to him a true and new power over them, so when a See is given to one bishop consecrated before, matter (for jurisdiction) is applied to him no otherwise than that certain persons become his subjects, which before they were not; nor do they become his subjects save by the fact that he receives as superior a new power altogether distinct from the power of Order or from consecration. Lastly, because, just as acts of pontifical jurisdiction, as such, are *not* acts of *Order* or *consecration*, *nor flow from it*, so neither are acts of episcopal jurisdiction functions of Order or consecration." (De Leg. iv, 4.) Let us now come to the application of the aforesaid marks.

ART. II. THE ROMAN CHURCH POSSESSES THE FOUR POSITIVE MARKS OF THE TRUE CHURCH.

§ I. The Roman Church Possesses Unity.

328. **A.** She is One in Her Doctrine. If we traverse *the earth from end to end*, we shall hear chanted and professed the same Creed by all whom the Church regards as her children; all admit the same principles, the same sacrifice, the same sacraments. If we ascend *the course of ages*, even to apostolic times, we see the same identical doctrine professed by the Faithful throughout Christendom.

Moreover, the Church possesses *a principle* which necessarily *preserves* this unity of doctrine. She professes as an essential dogma, that all men are bound to accept every doctrine formally taught by her under pain of being excluded from her communion, if they remain obstinate in their error.

Remark. No one has ever been able to show that the

Roman Church has ceased to teach a single dogma contained in the Apostolic writings, or that she ever admitted a doctrinal teaching in contradiction with those writings. Never has she *defined* an article of Faith without having previously proven that the Apostles had taught it, either in writing or by word of mouth. The Council, of Nice (A. D. 325), for instance, did not create the dogma of the divinity of Jesus Christ when it defined against the Arians the *Consubstantiality* of the Word, no more than the Council of Trent created the dogma of Eucharistic *Transubstantiation* when it defined it against the Protestants, who either denied it or perverted its nature. On the contrary, it is just because these doctrines were always believed by the Church that these Councils have been enabled to define them. Thus, when a few years ago the Church declared as articles of faith the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary (1854) and the Infallibility of the Roman Pontiff (1870), she did not add new articles to her doctrines; they are simply *subsequent developments* of the truths revealed by Jesus Christ, and taught from the beginning by the Church. They are truths *implicitly contained in the deposit of revelation*, which have been *brought into greater light*, the better to confound the adversaries of the ancient Faith and preserve the Faithful from pernicious errors.[1]

[1] If dogma is unchangeable as truth is unchangeable, this immutability does not exclude *progress*. This progress in the Church is nothing else than the development of the principles laid down by Jesus Christ. Thus, for instance, the Church has declared or defined, in three different Councils, that there are in Jesus Christ one person, two natures and two wills. These three definitions are but the logical development of the same truth, which in its primitive and revealed form has been known and taught at all times, that is, Jesus Christ is at one and the same time true God and true man.

The following observations will enable the reader to understand still better how doctrine is developed in the Church.

1. There exists in Revelation a certain number of points, which, from the first day of Christianity, have been formally and explicitly put forth for the belief of the Faithful, and proposed to their acceptance.

2. There are others, which originally were not explicitly so put forth, and which were destined, in the plan of Providence, to reach progressively the light in the course of time and under the direction of authority.

3. These last include in their history three different periods. In the first, they are scarcely noticed, either because of their metaphysical depth, which accounts for the fact that their connection with

"The Catholic Faith is no mere aggregation of theological decisions, but an organic body of truths, explaining, confirming and perfecting one another. Times and circumstances may concentrate the mind of the Church on one of these truths, rather than on another, and thus give it universal prominence. Or controversy and heresy may necessitate clear, definite, formulated decisions of the Faith. At another time the very devotions of the Faithful will evolve precise statements of doctrine. But in all this the *explicit* declarations are but the unfolding of the implicit tenets of Revelation. This "Development of Doctrine," or as it is technically called in theology, "Explication of Christian Doctrine," must, from the nature of the case, ever be going on. It permits us to say, with St. Vincent of Lerins (A. D. 450), "we hold that which has been believed *everywhere*, *always*, *and by all;* for this is what is truly and properly Catholic. And this we shall do if we follow *universality*, *antiquity* and *consent.*" The same distinguished writer explains his thought by the following concluding remark: "But some will say, shall we have no advancement of religion in the Church of Christ? Surely let us have the greatest that may be. Yes, let there be progress in the Church of Christ; but in such a way that there shall be true development, but no change of Faith. Let the revealed truths receive evidence, light, discrimination, but preserve, at the same time, their holiness, their integrity, their peculiarity."—Common., n.

principles formally revealed is not immediately perceived, or because of circumstances which do not permit every institution to manifest itself from the first day of its existence, or from the very impossibility, natural to the human mind, to think of everything at the same time.

At the second period these truths, which were, as it were, slumbering in the depths of the Christian conscience, begin to be discussed. People are more struck with their significance than they were previously; they are preached, they become new food for the piety of the Faithful. It then happens that some individuals will contest them, alleging the obscurity of tradition, and end by denying that they should be considered as forming part of the deposit of divine Revelation.

At the third period, authority steps in, raises them to the rank of Articles of Faith, and decides that they were originally contained in Revelation.—Abbé A. Pirenne, *Etudes Philosophiques* (Philosophical Studies), No. 47. See Cardinal Franzelin, *De Divina Scriptura et Traditione.*

23. See also Cardinal Newman, "Development of Christian Doctrine." (See Mgr. Capel, preface to "Faith of Catholics," vol. I.)

329. **B.** THE ROMAN CHURCH IS ONE IN HER MINISTRY. Nothing is more evident and easier to ascertain. Unity of Faith, which we have just proven to exist, is preserved in the Church by a ministry, which belongs to her alone; is unique, invariable and perfectly well known. The action of this ministry, kind and firm *(fortiter et suaviter)* at the same time, comes from Rome, the center of government, and goes by the intermediary Bishops and subordinate pastors across all the regions of the globe, to reach even the least of the members who compose the Church. The ordinary Faithful are united to their immediate pastors; these to their Bishops; the Bishops, in communion together, are united to the Pope, from whom they derive all their powers. This is reducing the most complicated multiplicity to the most wonderful unity. Here also there exists a principle, which preserves this unity; for who refuses to submit to the authority of the legitimate pastors is excluded from the bosom of the Church.

This unity of ministry, or of government, which we admire in our day, history shows us to have existed in the long series of past centuries since the dawn of the Christian era. She is unchangeable, because she is a divine institution. We cannot say the same as to *disciplinary laws*, established, as they have been, by *ecclesiastical* authority; these may vary, according to circumstances. Prudence itself requires that they be changed or abolished, according to the requirements of the times. Worship may also undergo certain minor modifications as to accessory rites or ceremonies, though it ever remains the same in essential things, established by Jesus Christ. "*Semper eadem*" is her proud but legitimate boast.

330. OBJECTION. At the time of the great Schism of the West, from A. D. 1378 to 1417, there were two Popes, and in 1409 even three. In the earlier period of the Schism, viz., up to the election of Alexander V. in the Council of Pisa, there were in the Church two rival *obediences*, as they

were called. On one side we see Pope Urban VI. and his successors at Rome; on the other side there was Clement VII. and likewise his successors, residing at Avignon in France. Some of the Catholic nations submitted to Urban VI., others to Clement VII. Was not the Church thus deprived, for nearly fifty years, of the unity of government, which is held to be an essential mark or note, by which to recognize the true Church of Christ?

Answer. To give a complete and satisfactory answer to this difficulty, we deem it advisable to point out briefly the cause or origin of this so-called Schism of the West, and indicate the personages that figured in the rival contest for the Chair of Peter. The high position, which the Papacy occupied in the society of the middle ages, caused sovereigns to strive by all means to appropriate its influence to themselves. France, we must acknowledge, had deserved by real services the consideration and regard shown her; unhappily she did not know how to use them with sufficient moderation. Her preponderance in the Sacred College became excessive, and in the year 1306 a French Pope, Clement V., fixed his seat at Avignon in France. His successors imitated him, to the great displeasure of a considerable part of Christendom, especially of the Romans. Soon two parties were formed, the one advocating the Pope's return to Rome, the other his permanent establishment in France; and this gave rise to the election of two simultaneously reigning Popes, viz., Urban VI. in Rome and Clement VII. at Avignon. Their respective successors were as follows: In Rome—Urban VI., 1378; Boniface IX., 1389; Innocent VII., 1404; Gregory XII., 1406; Alexander V., 1409; John XXIII., 1410. At Avignon—Clement VII.,1378; Benedict XIII., 1394.

The Schism would have been crushed at the outset had not France upheld the cause of Clement VII., who went to reside at Avignon. The influence of France prevailed with the nations, accustomed to yield to her political sway as the Queen of Naples and the Kings of Cyprus and Scotland. To these nations only did the authority of the anti-pope

extend, notwithstanding all the proclamations and decrees of the University of Paris to the contrary.

As to the important question on which side existed the legitimate succession of Sovereign Pontiffs, we feel that we can hardly err in following in this particular, as in all others, the usage of the Roman Church. As we learn from official documents, she has registered on the roll of Sovereign Pontiffs the names of those who sat at Rome during the period of dissension, placing among the anti-popes the two Pontiffs of Avignon. But independently of the principle of authority, the facts of history amply justify the opinion, which we adopt. Urban VI. was elected in Rome April 9, 1378, and acknowledged as lawful Pope by all the Churches of the Catholic World. The Cardinals, who had elected him, also took part in the ceremony of his coronation, and gave notice of his election to all the princes of Christendom, and in particular to the Cardinals who had remained behind at Avignon. Their words were as follows: "On the feast of Pentecost, at the very same hour, when the Holy Ghost descended upon the Apostles, we, *acting undoubtedly under the guidance of the same Spirit, by a free and unanimous vote*, chose the Archbishop of Bari, a man of great virtue and merit." In view of this open admission, Urban VI., was the legitimate Pope, and consequently the election, which these same Cardinals made of Clement VII., several months after (Sept. 21, 1378), was illegitimate, and could not be justified on any ground.

The point at issue, then, might be summed up in the question: Was the election of Urban VI. canonical or not? In reply to the repeated protests of the French canonists, the Oxford theologians brought it to a triumphant conclusion. Their leading arguments were the following:

1. It is alleged that the election was not free; but the Roman people did not limit the choice of the Conclave to any particular individual. They only demanded, and not without reason, that the Pope should be a Roman; and the Cardinals did not even yield to this demand, but chose a Neapolitan of whom the people had never thought before. They

cannot, therefore, complain that they were forced to promote a man not of their own choice.

2. When the Archbishop of Bari was informed of his election, he resolutely refused the honor offered to him. The Cardinals entreated him to yield to their prayers. If the election had not before been free, it certainly became so then. Instead of recalling, the Cardinals confirmed it by their entreaties. They cannot complain that Urban VI. was raised to the Papal chair against their will.

3. The Cardinals crowned the new Pope. Even those who had left Rome returned for the ceremony. How could they have spontaneously returned to crown a Pope, whom they had not elected?

4. If there was any violence, it was only during one night; whereas for three whole months the Cardinals remained quietly with Urban VI, received Holy Communion from his hand, pledged him their fidelity, sought and received his favors. The people did not stand in arms around the Pontifical palace during these three months. The Cardinals were then free; they freely communicated with Urban VI. as rightful Pope.

5. There is but one alternative; either the Cardinals knew and believed that Bartholomew Prignano, Urban VI., was Pope, or they knew and believed that he was not. If, in their belief, Prignano was Pope, why did they elect Clement VII.? If he was not Pope, why did they acquaint all Christendom with his election as legitimate? If the notification was a lie, they tried to deceive all the Holy Church of God; from that time forth their testimony must, therefore, of justice and necessity, become worthless.

To us these arguments seem conclusive; nor do we know that they have as yet been answered. Thus it is that in our view of the case, as in the judgment of the Roman Church, Urban VI. was the rightful Sovereign Pontiff and Clement VII. an anti-pope. Consequently the successors of Urban VI. in Rome were the legitimate Popes, whilst those of Clement VII. at Avignon were illegitimate. (See Darras, "General History of the Catholic Church," vol, III, pp. 537–538.)

But peace and concord were finally restored to the Church, at the General Council of Constance, convened by the lawful Pope John XXIII, when through the resignation of the rival claimants, John XXIII. and Gregory XII., of Rome, and the deposition of Benedict XIII., of Avignon, the Holy See was considered vacant, and Martin V. was elected Pope, Nov. 11, 1417, and recognized by all Christendom as the legitimate successor of St. Peter and Vicar of Christ. From this historical exposition it evidently appears that the series of legitimate Supreme Pontiffs was not interrupted, and that consequently neither the unity of authority nor that of government ceased to exist, even during the period of dissension *incorrectly* called the *Western Schism*. In fact, "Schismatics," says St. Thomas (2. $2^{æ}$, q. xxxix, a. 1), "in the strict sense, are those who of their own will and intention sever themselves from the unity of the Church; who consequently refuse to be under the Supreme Pontiff." Now here there was no real schism among the nations of Christendom, though divided in their opinion regarding the legitimate successor of St. Peter. This division of judgment regarded the rights of the different rival Popes, but not the dogma of the primacy of St. Peter and the Unity of the Apostolic See. All believed in one invisible Head of the Church, but under existing circumstances, and the uncertainty and confusion caused by contending parties, they did not know which was the true Pope. It was quite possible for those on either side to be in good faith and safety of conscience, though they might, in inculpable ignorance, be adherents of the illegitimately elected Pope. Hence we are justified in asserting that the sad division here referred to should not be called a *schism*, because the number of obediences did not impair the principle of Unity, since all the Churches equally held, as an article of Faith, that there is but one only Roman Church, and one only Sovereign Pontiff, the successor of St. Peter, who was indeed for each one of them the Pontiff they respectively acknowledged; and not several Roman Churches and several Sovereign Pontiffs. The variety of claims to authority, then, divided

Christianity only upon a *matter of form*, not upon a *fundamental point* of law and doctrine.

Hence this schism, which is explained by an error as to a question not of *principle* but of *fact*, far from weakening our thesis, proves on the contrary the deeply rooted spirit of unity which animated the members of the whole Church. No one admitted the simultaneous existence of two legitimate heads; everyone was convinced that, according to the divine institution of the Papacy, there was and there could but be one Head to the Church founded by Christ. But who was at that time this sole Head of the Church? Evidently a part of Christendom was mistaken in its preference; but it was mistaken in good faith, and the Faithful could be in perfect security of conscience under either obedience.

Whilst deploring these unfortunate dissensions, we must say that never did the Church appear more admirable than during that fearful tempest, which so violently shook and tossed to and fro the bark of Peter; never did she more splendidly show that none but a divine hand was at the helm. Had the Roman Catholic Church been a purely human institution, she must inevitably have fallen at a juncture when all the resources of genius, the powers of intellect, the united endeavors of learned doctors, the combined authority of Christian princes, and even the efforts of the very Saints were powerless to abate the raging storm. An uncompromising opponent of the Papacy (Gregorovius, B. 6th, 3d ed. p.620) was candid enough to acknowledge "that any secular kingdom would have perished; yet so marvellous was the organization of this spiritual dynasty, and so indestructible the idea of the Papacy, that the schism only served to demonstrate its indivisibility."

REFERENCES—(A) UNITY OF THE ROMAN CHURCH.

1. Rhodes, "The Visible Unity of the Catholic Church," in two volumes. Vol. 2, p. 325 et seqq. London, Longmans, Green & Co., 1870.

2. "The Faith of Catholics," in three volumes, by Fr. Waterworth. American edition, F. Pustet & Co., 1885; vol. I, p. 119–199.

3. "The True Faith of our Forefathers," by a professor of theology in Woodstock College, Maryland; p. 14-36.

4. MacLaughlin (Rev. John), "Is One Religion as Good as Another?" Burns & Oates, London; Benziger Brothers, New York, 1891, p. 123–160.

5. "Christian Apology," by P. Schanz, Pustet, New York, 1896; ch. vi, p. 170–197.

(B) Schism of the West (1378–1417).

1. Pastor Dr. Ludwig, "History of the Popes from the Close of the Middle Ages," eight volumes issued (1898), John Hodges, London, 1891; vol. I, p. 164 et seqq.

2. Alzog, "Manual of Universal Church History," in three volumes, Robert Clarke, Cincinnati, O.; vol. II, p. 845 et seqq.

3. Darras (L'Abbé J. E.), "A General History of the Catholic Church," in three volumes, P. O'Shea, New York, 1871; vol. III. p. 528 et seq.

4. Kenrick (Very Rev. Francis Patrick), "The Primacy of the Apostolic See Vindicated," John Murphy & Co., Baltimore, 1857; p. 236 et seqq.

5. "Works of Right Rev. John England," in five volumes, John Murphy & Co., Baltimore, 1849; vol. I, p. 313, et seqq.

6. O'Reilly (Rev. Edmund J., S. J.), "The Relations of the Church to Society," John Hodges, London, 1892; ch. xxiii, "The Council of Constance."

7. Cardinal Mazzella, S. J., "De Ecclesia Disp. III, Rome; published by Propaganda.

8. "Studies in Church History," in six volumes, by Rev. N. Parsons, Pustet & Co., New York, 1896; "The Great Western Schism," vol. II, p. 522–550.

9. "The History of St. Catherine of Siena and her Companions," by Mother Frances Raphael, O. S. D. (Augusta Theodosia Drane), Burns & Oates, London; chapter on "Western Schism."

§ II. The Roman Church Possesses Sanctity.

331. The Roman Church is holy in her *final purpose*,

which is the sanctification of souls. She is holy in the *means* she employs; in her *dogmas*, which are assailed only because of their sublimity and because many of them, as to their essence, are above the powers of human reason, though not contrary to it (see n. 141, 142, 144, 145); in her *morality*, honored by the homage of her opponents themselves, a morality which proscribes every vice, teaches every virtue, and rises to the perfection of the evangelical counsels; holy in her *Sacraments*, abundant sources of grace and sanctification; in her *worship*, the most *purely spiritual* that ever existed, and absolutely free from every cruel or superstitious practice. And finally, she is holy in the multitude of her *members*, who faithfully follow her instructions, and those alone depart from holiness and are slaves to sin who refuse to conform to her moral teachings and injunctions.

Who can count the legions of saints engendered by the Roman Church? Not to speak of the Christian heroes of the first centuries, where shall there be found, outside of this Church, men who could compare to Saints like Benedict, Thomas Aquinas, Francis of Assisi, Ignatius of Lozola, Francis Xavier, Vincent de Paul, Francis de Sales, Elizabeth of Hungary, St. Theresa, and an infinity of others? Besides the many Saints of every century, raised to the honor of the altars by canonization, Saints who had no other Faith but that of Rome, and whom Rome alone can claim as her children, there is an infinite number of other members of the Church, who have sanctified themselves by virtues no less real, though hidden to the eyes of men. Even to this day, in the midst of the world's corruption, there are performed, under the same divine inspiration, as many good works and acts of virtue as during preceding centuries.

This eminent sanctity of the heroes of the Roman Church God Himself has been pleased, at all times, to proclaim and manifest to the world *by the most wonderful miracles*. These prodigies, which can only be attributed to divine intervention (see nn. 202–212), are so well attested by undeniable testimony, that to doubt them would be rejecting history, and even renouncing reason itself.

For many centuries the examination of the reality of miracles has been reserved to the Pope; we find in the Capitularies of Charlemagne the prohibition even to publish one of them before the judgment of the Sovereign Pontiff. No one is ignorant of the rigorous severity with which the Sacred Congregation of Rites, under the direction of the Sovereign Pontiff, proceeds in cases of canonization and the examination of miracles. And yet, how many miracles have been authentically proven within the last centuries! Let us cite among others those of St. Francis Xavier, St. Joseph of Cupertino, St. Philip Neri, St. Francis de Sales. The learned Pope Benedict XIV, in the appendices of his great work on the canonization of the Saints, relates the striking miracles of some of them, of St. Elizabeth of Portugal, St. Pius V., St. Andrew Avellino, St. Felix de Cantalice, St. Catherine of Bologna, etc. The *Acta Sanctorium*, a gigantic monument erected to the glory of the Saints by the Jesuit Bollandists, would amply suffice to prove the continuity of this divine testimony in favor of the Catholic Church. (See n. 239 p. 225, note on Bollandists and their work.)

In connection with this gigantic work, we deem it advisable to publish these additional items:

"In the second week of last November was celebrated at Brussels the golden jubilee of religious life of Pére Ch. de Smedt, President of the Society of the Bollandists. Father van der Heyden, in one of his Louvain letters to the Portland *Catholic Sentinel*, made this celebration the peg whereon to hang a very interesting little essay on the Bollandists and their work, from which we condense the following: The originator of the great biography of Saints called '*Acta Sanctorum*' was the Flemish Jesuit Roesweyd, who worked about thirty years to gather the first materials; but fame was first given to the colossal enterprise by Fr. John de Bolland, S. J. (born near Maestricht in 1596, died in 1665), who published the first volume in 1643. Bolland was thirty-five years at the task, his associate Henschen, forty-six, and his other collaborator, Papebroch, forty-five. The work was continued uninterruptedly by members of the Society of

Jesus till the Suppression, in 1773. The Revolution scattered them, but their precious library was fortunately preserved. In 1837 the Jesuits were prevailed upon, with the aid of a grant by the Belgian government, to take up again the abandoned work. The resuscitated hagiographical society took a new start under the direction of Fr. van Hecke. After eight years of preliminary work, the fifty-fourth volume appeared in 1845. Eight others have since followed, the last being published in '94. The sixty-third, which will treat of the Saints of the early part of November, will not be ready for some time to come.

A second edition of the forty-five first volumes of the '*Acta*' was issued between 1734 and 1770; and a third edition, up to the fifty-ninth volume, was brought out by Palmé in 1869. There are about ten complete sets in the trade yet. The price of a set is $600. The late volumes sell at $15 a volume.

At present there are six 'Bollandists.' When they are not making researches in libraries or foreign countries, they work in what they call their 'shop,' at Brussels—an immense library-room, containing over 100,000 volumes treating of history, archæology, patrology, and hagiography. This library is unique in the world for its specialty. Besides the books in the library, the Fathers receive, to help them in their researches, six hundred reviews. They themselves publish a periodical, the *Analecta Bollandiana*, as a manifestation of their vitality and to keep up an intercourse with the learned historians of the world. *Confingant quidpiam tale heretici, si possunt!*—(Let heretics produce something like this, if they can!

Volume II of Wetzer and Welte's '*Kirchenlexikon*' contains a lengthier article on the subject, by Andreas Schmid, which we have consulted in making the above synopsis of Fr. van der Heyden's paper, correcting a few slight errors."
—*The Review*, conducted by Arthur Preuss, St. Louis, Mo., January 30, 1902.

If there are not as many miracles in our day as in the first days of the Church, we have already given the reason.

Let us not forget, moreover, *that the miracles of the early times retain for us their force as proofs*, for they are grounded upon sure and certain testimony. To-day, as then, they proclaim the sanctity of *that* Church, in whose favor they were performed, and they show that God gives His most manifest approval to virtues practiced by members sheltered within her pale. Finally, the preservation of the Church, and the marvelous effects which she continues to produce in the world, are true miracles, which become more striking as the centuries roll onward. (See nn. 254, 255.) Besides, our own century has been the witness of divine marvels. Who can deny it? It suffices for the most exacting critic to read the life of the venerable Curé of Ars and the interesting History of Notre Dame de Lourdes, by Henri Lasserre, as well "Les Episodes," of the same author, to be convinced that the power of God still remains with the children of His Church. (See n. 238, p. 227, Note.)

REFERENCES. 1. Thebaud, S. J. (Rev. Aug. J.), "The Church and the Moral World—Consideration on the Holiness of the Church;" Benziger Bros., New York, 1881. A masterpiece on the subject.

2. "The Holiness of the Church in the Nineteenth Century," edited by Rev. John P. M. Schleuter, S. J.; Benziger Bros., New York, 1902.

§ III. The Roman Church Possesses Catholicity.

332. The Roman Church is Catholic in time and space; she alone has always been designated by that glorious name. Already in the days of St. Augustin the name of Catholic indicated exclusively those who belonged to the Roman Church, and at all times the Faithful could say with reason: Christian is my name, Catholic is my surname. The several reasons why the Church is called Catholic or Universal are clearly set forth by our Lord, speaking to his Apostles (Matth. xxvii, 19, 20): "Going therefore, teach ye *all nations*, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe *all things* whatsoever I have commanded you: and behold I am

with you *all days* even to the consummation of the world." According to these words of Christ, the Church was to spread throughout the *whole* world, it was to teach *all* truth, and to last throughout *all* time. Here Catholicity, therefore, is three-fold—Catholicity of extension, Catholicity of doctrine, Catholicity of duration.

After having taken possession of the world by the five thousand men of every tongue converted by St. Peter at Jerusalem, the Church has not ceased to spread and win to her fold new children in every corner of the globe. The reader should here recall what we have said about the rapid propagation of the Gospel throughout the whole world. (See nn. 244–253.)

Already at the close of the first century the Church had passed the limits of the Roman Empire, and from that time she has never ceased to gain ground among the most barbarous nations of the earth, accustomed, as she was, to recover in one country what she lost in another, and always seeing the marvelous fruitfulness of her youth renewed in some part or other of the world. St. Francis Xavier alone gained more converts to the Roman Catholic Church in India and Japan than were lost to her allegiance in Europe by the Protestant Reformation.

And in our day this fruitfulness strikes all observers. If we pass in review the most distant countries, the most obscure islands of the ocean, we will find Catholics everywhere. The Roman Church is not only spread throughout all the countries of the world, but it greatly surpasses in numbers each of the other Christian denominations. (See Fourth Conference of Lacordaire, and n. 280, p. 296.)

The reader will consult with profit the excellent pamphlet of Monsignor Capel, entitled "Catholic," an essential and exclusive attribute of the true Church. F. Pustet, New York, 1884. See also "Notes on the Catholic Name," by Rev. Telesphor Austin; Pustet & Co., New York, 1899.

The Americanized Encyclopedia Brittanica, vol. viii, p. 5086, reproduces the following statistics bearing on our subject:

"The author of *Katholischer Missions-Atlas*, Rev. O. Werner, S. J., largely furnished with propaganda returns, distributes the number of Catholics as follows: In Europe, 150,684,050; in Asia, 8,311,800; in Africa, 2,656,205; in both Americas, 51,422,566; in Australia and adjacent islands, 443,142; total, 213,518,063. But he considers that this calculation gives less than the whole number of Catholics throughout the world."

The *Ecclesiastical Dictionary*, by Rev. J. Thein, basing the calculation on reliable statistics, gives the following grand total of Catholics, 234,868,000. See *Catholic Belief*, p. 398–400, for several census tables.

These figures prove the truth of what we stated above (p. 296), that as a matter of fact the Roman Catholic Church counts more adherents to her Creed than any other religious belief, whether Christian or anti-Christian.

§ IV. The Roman Church Possesses Apostolicity.

333. **A.** THE ROMAN CHURCH GOES BACK TO THE APOSTLES BY HER DOCTRINE. This doctrine is to-day the same as that of the Apostles; between the most ancient creeds or symbols of Faith, between the writings and decisions of the first centuries and those of our times, the identity is complete. This we have proven when speaking of unity of doctrine in the Roman Church.

Protestants claim, it is true, that after the first centuries the Roman Church *created* new dogmas, for instance that of the Real Presence, the existence of Purgatory, the Invocation of Saints. But it is not enough to assert, *proof* must be given: let them say *when*, *how* and *by whom* were these dogmas introduced into the Church. This they have never done, and very naturally. Meanwhile, that which they assert without proofs, the Church has a right simply to deny, because she is in possession, *quod gratis asseritur gratis negatur*, as logicians say. Proofs, however, are not wanting to show that there has been no change in her belief. We have seen with what zeal Popes and Bishops, from the very commencement, constantly opposed every doctrinal innova-

tion. They would, therefore, have been equally opposed to the introduction of the important dogmas objected to by the Protestants. But they have not done so, as ecclesiastical history, always so careful in matters of that kind, is silent as to that point. Undoubtedly no one will venture to say that all the members of the Church, pastors and flock, in all parts of the world, agreed together at a given moment, to admit such numerous and very serious innovations. Even if this had been possible, the heretics of the time would not have failed to raise their voices; condemned, as they themthemselves were, by the Church as innovators, they would have eagerly seized the occasion to retort the argument and reproach the Church herself with the very innovations, that she reproved in others.

334. B. The Roman Catholic Church goes back to the Apostles by the uninterrupted succession of her lawful rulers. History shows in the see of St. Peter an unbroken line of 258 legitimate Pontiffs. All the Popes have called themselves and proclaimed to the world that they were the successors of the Chief of the Apostles and the inheritors of his supreme authority. The Churches, which are subordinate to the Church of Rome and form with her a united whole, offer also a series of pastors, deriving their mission from the Apostolic See.

Objection. The legitimate succession of the Roman Pontiffs has been many times interrupted by schisms, and by the long sojourn of the Popes at Avignon from 1305 to 1377.

Answer. These facts, as it has been shown above (n. 330), have in no way interrupted the legitimate succession of the supreme heads of the Roman Church.

1. During the schism there has always been one legitimate Pope, though his legitimacy may have been contested, in good faith or through ignorance by a part of the Church. Does the revolt of a province prevent a prince from continuing to be the legitimate sovereign of that province, which, in good or bad faith, rejects his authority? As to the great Schism of

the West, we have already spoken at sufficient length concerning it (n. 330).

2. As the residence of a prince outside of the capital of his kingdom, does not deprive him of the sovereignty over his legitimate dominions, so the residence of the Popes at Avignon did not prevent them from being *Bishops of Rome*, and, *as such*, Heads of the whole Church. (See copious references cited above, n. 330.)

Conclusion of Article II.

I. In the nineteenth century, in the days in which we live, as well as in the past, the Roman Church is *one:* (1) All her members, though of all tongues, and political parties, and forms of government, are united in closest communion under the Visible Head, who, together with the Episcopate held by the successors of the Apostolic College —the Bishops dispersed through the whole communion, whom the Holy Ghost appoints—rule and govern this body politic, this living Organization. (2) There is *one* and the same principle of faith, namely divine authority and testimony for *one* body of doctrines held by her pastors and people individually and collectively. (3) There is *one* sacramental system and worship, receiving the same explanation and producing the same effects in the possession of all her children.

II. The Roman Church is *Holy:* (1) Because her doctrine is in itself holy, ever inviting men to ascend higher and higher in virtue. (2) She is *holy* because she has begotten a mighty army of heroic saints, and martyrs, and virgins. On every soil has she planted and founded institutions, created and directed by those who, wishing to be perfect, give up home and wealth to labor for their Master in saving souls. (3) She is *holy* because, consumed by the desire to enkindle the fire of divine love on earth, she is instant in season, and out of season in preaching the Gospel to those who are in sin or in darkness. The glory of converting Pagan nations is hers. This no Protestant sect, backed by illimitable wealth or the greatest political power,

has ever been able to accomplish. (See "Christian Missions," by T. W. M. Marshall, 2 volumes.)

(III.) The Roman Church is *Catholic*: (1) because she is of no one nation; her constitution and her teaching are fitted to all peoples and forms of government. (2) Because her principle of faith is applicable to all, young and old, learned and unlearned. (3) Because her continuity and identity of existence from Pentecost day till now can be plainly traced. (4) Because she alone has the whole of Revelation—the Faith once delivered to the Saints. Circumstances have obliged her to formulate the Faith in Dogmatic Decisions and Creeds so as to bear witness to what is contained in the *deposit* of Faith; but such authoritative declarations are no additions to the Faith, they do but unwrap what it contains and explicitly expose its separate doctrines. (see n. 328.) (5) Because she admits of no rival; she is ever vigilant, condemning schism and heresy; by friend and by foe she is known as THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

(IV.) The Roman Catholic Church is Apostolic: (1) because she teaches identically the same doctrines taught by the Apostles, and (2) because her ministers derive their powers from the Apostolic See by an uninterrupted succession of lawful pastors, each one of whom is able, if need be, to trace back his ordination, or the episcopal consecration and the power of jurisdiction to the Apostolic Body established by Christ nearly nineteen centuries ago.

The Church, which is called Catholic and Roman, is the only Church whose line of pontiffs and prelates and priests runs back to the beginning. Two hundred and fifty-eight Popes, from St. Peter to Leo XIII., have occupied the See of Rome. There is nothing to obscure or invalidate their title to the Apostolic See. As Leo XIII., followed Pius IX., and the latter Gregory XVI., so all the rest back to the first century, when Clement succeeded Cletus, and Cletus Linus, and Linus Peter, to whom Christ said: "Upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." The vigilance of the Church at every ordination, and at the consecration of every Bishop, makes doubt

impossible concerning the valid succession of pastors. Besides, her bitterest adversaries cannot gainsay her claim to Apostolicity. No time later than that of the Apostles can be assigned as her origin, nor can one break be pointed out in her orders or mission. All this is so evident that Apostolicity is not only a property of that Church, but it stands out also as a mark that identifies her with the Church founded by Christ.

The Roman Church then possesses all the notes or marks of the true Church; and as Jesus Christ founded but one Church, it follows that the Roman Church is truly the identical Church established by the Redeemer of the World, the Church appointed to guide men to the attainment of their last happy destiny, eternal happiness in the world to come.

References: 1. "The Faith of Catholics," by Father Waterworth; American edition, Pr. Pustet & Co., New York, 1885, vol. 1, p. 255-282.

2. "The True Faith of our Forefathers," by a Professor of Theology in Woodstock College, Maryland; ch. v, "Apostolicity."

3. "The Primacy of the Apostolic See," by Archbishop F. P. Kenrick; ch. xviii; John Murphy, Baltimore, 1857.

ART. III. PROTESTANTISM DOES NOT POSSESS THE MARKS OF THE TRUE CHURCH OF JESUS CHRIST.

335. Remark. After the preceding demonstration, the two articles, which follow, might appear superfluous. We add them, nevertheless, as a superabundant proof, and especially to facilitate for our separated brethren wandering in the ways of error their return to the fold of the Saviour, Who alone is the Way the Truth and the Life, and Who so ardently desires that there be but one fold under the guidance of one shepherd.

There is in our day but one important heresy, Protestantism. We include under this general name every belief which, holding to Christian revelation, protests against the authority of the Roman Catholic Church, and appeals to the Scriptures as the only source of revealed truth. In

reality Protestantism is not a definite religion. The numberless sects, which bear its name, have between each other no other bond than this negative name, which suits every heresy; they have no other principle of life but the dogmas and precepts, which they have taken from the Catholic Church, the Church from which they separated; the scattered remnants of faith which they have retained as parts of their belief. See "The Religion of Protestants," in Thoughts for all times by Mgr. John S. Vaughan, O'Shea & Co., New York, 1899.

336. HISTORICAL NOTICE. We shall at first say a few words about the authors of Protestantism.

Martin Luther was born at Eisleben, in Saxony, in 1483. He embraced monastic life in the convent of the Augustinians of Erfurt, and was sent by his superiors to the University of Wittemberg to teach theology. He there made himself remarkable especially for his love of innovations and by indomitable pride Leon X. having in 1517 entrusted the Dominicans with the publication of certain indulgences, this monk of vivid imagination and ardent character, feeling slighted probably by the preference given to another Order than his own, began violently to attack in the preachers of the indulgences, what he called abuses and exaggeration of speech. It was not long before he was carried away into attacking the institution of indulgences themselves, as well as the power of granting them; then urged on as he was by the logical consequences of a false principle, he passed from one error to another. Even at that time we find already formulated in his writings and sermons to the people that principle which was to play such an important part in his doctrinal system: *faith alone produces the remission of sins.* It was only after long and laborious efforts, made by Leo X., to bring him back to truth and obedience that a bull of excommunication was fulminated against the rebellious monk. Far from submitting the heresiarch caused the bull to be publicly burned at Wittemberg. From that moment the revolt was consummated, Protestantism had found its first apostle. Eight years after his re-

volt, in 1525, Martin Luther married an ex-nun named Catherine Bora, and died in 1546. See Audin, *Vie de Luther* (Life of Luther); *Vie de Calvin* (Life of Calvin); *Histoire de Leon X.* (History of Leo X). *L'Allemagne et la Reforme*, (Germany and the Reformation,) by Janssen, vol. 2; *La fin de Luther* (The Death of Luther) by Lorrenz.

Shortly after Luther, *Zwinglius* began to dogmatize in Switzerland, and *Calvin* at Geneva. Their doctrines are far from being the same as Luther's, but they agree in contradicting the teachings of the Roman Church, and in allowing much freedom and ease to the passions. Their doctrines are evidently in open contradiction with those of the Roman Catholic Church.

As to Henry VIII., King of England, it is known how, after having written a book against Luther, and even after obtaining the title, which he solicited, of Defender of the Faith, he dragged his people into schism. His purpose was to be free to gratify his lust and satisfy his unruly passions. As the Pope, Clement VII., refused to second his criminal desires, by authorizing the divorce from Catherine of Aragon, his lawful wife, he broke with the Roman Church and had himself proclaimed head of the Anglican Church (1534). It was not long before heresy was engrafted upon his schism.

Without further insisting upon these well known facts, we shall now proceed to show that Protestantism has *none of the positive marks* of the true Church of Jesus Christ.

§ I. Protestantism is absolutely devoid of Unity, either in Doctrine or in Ministry or Government.

337. **A.** It does not Possess Unity of Doctrine. (*a*) The first Founders of Protestantism were, at its very origin, *in complete disagreement* as to matters of belief, and these doctrinal divergences have only gone on increasing from that time. Among their disciples, their dissensions have multiplied to such an extent that it may be said almost literally that the diversity of beliefs equalled that of individuals: *quot capita tot sententiae* (as many opinions

as there are heads). Luther himself had to admit it as early as 1525: "There are almost as many sects and beliefs as there are heads," he wrote; "this one will not admit baptism, that one rejects the sacrament of the altar, another places another world between the present one and the day of judgment, some teach that Jesus Christ is not God. There is not an individual, however clownish he may be, who does not claim to be inspired by the Holy Ghost, and who does not put forth as prophecies his ravings and dreams." (*An meine Kritiker*, by Janssen, p. 181.) The number of sects which have freed themselves from every dependence on each other cannot be counted. According to official reports there are now in the United States of America fifty-six *principal* sects; by adding secondary sects we have 288 sects. Whitaker's Almanac for 1895 enumerates 274 Religious Denominations in England alone. In the single city of London and its suburbs we find more than one hundred different sects. In each sect professions of faith follow each other as leaves on a tree; hence a Protestant minister of Kiel, Harms, has said that he would engage to write on his thumb-nail all the doctrines still uniformly admitted among Protestants. The following is a list of some Protestant sects in the United States of America: Adventist or 2nd Adventist, Baptist (Regular), Free-will Baptist, Seventh-Day Baptist, German Seventh-Day Baptist, Free Communion Baptist, Anti-Mission Baptist, Six-Principles Baptist, Cath. Apost. Church (not Roman), Christian, Christian Connection, Christian Perfectionist, Church of God, Congregationalist Unitarian, Congregationalist, Disciples (Campbellites), African Methodist, Zion African Methodist, Methodist Episcopal (South), Free Methodist, Western Primitive Methodist, Independent Methodist, Moravians (Unitas Fratrum), Mormon, New Jerusalem (Swedenborgian), Presbyterian (Regular), Presbyterian (Old School), Presbyterian (New School), Presbyterians (Associated and United), Reformed Church (late Dutch Reformed), Dunkers, Episcopal (Protestant), Evangelical Association, Friends or Quakers, Hicksites, Lutheran, Mennonites, Methodist, Methodist Episcopal, Methodist Protestant, Methodist

Church, Reformed Church (late German Reformed), Reformed Mennonites, River Brethren, Second Advent, Shakers, Spiritualist, True Wesleyan, Unitarian, Unitarian Congregationalist, United Brethren in Christ, Universalist. Here we are confronted with a veritable sea of confusion and listening to a perfect babel of conflicting tongues.

(*b*) Not only were the first reformers far from agreeing as to religious beliefs, but *each* one of them would *change his opinions without any hesitation*, rejecting and accepting by turns the same beliefs, according to the requirements of the moment. Luther went so far as to threaten his followers, on several occasions, that he would retract all his innovations, if they persisted in raising trouble. According to Melancthon, the most moderate of the Reformers, "Articles of Faith must be frequently changed, and made to accord with time and circumstances."

(*c*) These variations in beliefs among all the founders of Protestantism, and since their time, should not surprise anyone; they are the *necessary consequence* of the Protestant rule of faith, that is, of the principle which determines and decides their beliefs, for Protestants reject the Catholic principle of authority of the Church, divinely commissioned to determine what are the inspired *Scriptures* and authentic *Traditions*, and authorized to interpret them in an infallible manner. According to Protestants, it is the Bible alone, interpreted by individual reason, which should make known to each person what he is obliged to believe. One can easily foresee the inevitable consequences of such a destructive principle. The poet's saying is here literally verified:

> "In Religion,
> What damned error, but some sober brow
> Will bless it, and approve it with a text?"
> —*Merchant of Venice*, Act III, sc. 2.

Protestants soon arrived at the stage of rejecting as apocryphal many books of the Old and even of the New Testament, and already in his day Bossuet had ample materials to write his masterpiece entitled "L'Histoire des Variations Protestantes" (History of Protestant Variations).

338. *Worship* being but the *expression of Faith—forma precandi est lex credendi*—and diversity of belief necessarily bringing about diversity of religious rites and ceremonies, it was inevitable that there should be introduced into Protestantism a great variety of practices, as to the sacraments, sacrifice and prayer. Thus some will admit this particular sacrament, others will reject it, and among those who admit it, some will understand it in one way, others in another. Luther, for instance reduced the number of sacraments from seven to two. Moreover, according to the Lutheran idea, they do not produce *interior* sanctification. Justification consists not in the fact that sin is effaced, but that it is covered by faith in the merits of Jesus Christ. As to the Eucharist, some admit the real Presence of Jesus Christ in the consecrated Host, others only see in it a figure of Him. Unable to resist the clearness of the sacred texts, which affirm this presence, Luther wished nevertheless to introduce a radical change in this Catholic dogma. According to his new doctrine, the body and blood of Jesus Christ do not become present by the *changing* of the elements of bread and wine, viz., by *transubstantiation*, but they are there *with* the bread and wine and *under* them. Moreover, according to him, Jesus Christ is present only *at the moment* that the Eucharist is *received*; this sacrament, he says, was instituted *only for use*, and not in any way to be at the same time a true external and visible *sacrifice*. In his eyes, the Mass is an abominable idolatry. As to Jesus Christ Himself, some acknowledge Him as God, others refuse to adore Him. The different ways of administering the sacraments are not less numerous. Finally, some pray for the dead, others do not; and whilst all Catholics pray for each other, and also for heretics, Schismatics, Jews and infidels, we see nothing similar in the dissenting sects. (Read Lacordaire, 27th Conference.)

339. Remark. We admit that in reality the greater number of Protestants follow any minister who possesses the art of commanding their attention, and whose opinions unite a certain number of supporters. But besides the fact that such

an authority is purely human, and that it is contrary to the fundamental principle of Protestantism, private interpretation of the Bible, it is impossible under such a system to avoid diversity of belief. Why, indeed, should ministers be more in accord with each other than the simple Faithful themselves?

It is also true that, to preserve a shadow of unity, certain Protestants have recourse to formulas of faith, to symbols and to synodal decrees. Already Luther, acting contrary to his fundamental rule of faith, composed a catechism and made it obligatory on all his followers. Much more, he dared to write the following words, and others of a like nature: "There is no angel in heaven, and much less no man on earth, who can and who will dare judge *my* doctrine. Whosoever shall not adopt it, cannot be saved; whosoever believes otherwise than I, is doomed to hell. Whosoever receives not my doctrine cannot attain salvation." (*Sammtl. Werke*, vol. xxviii, p. 144.) Is it possible to contradict more formally the doctrine of *private interpretation?* Under such conditions, it would have been better, many Protestants very rightly said to themselves, to have remained subject to the great and ancient authority of the Church of Rome.

Conclusion. It is evident, the absence of unity of faith is an absolutely incurable wound with Protestants. There are *Protestant sects*, but there is not, and there cannot be, a *Protestant religion*, for the reason that there is no common faith, no unity of doctrine.

340. B. Protestantism has not Unity of Ministry or Government. Each sect, for the very reason that it has its own belief apart, is independent of all others; moreover, as a fact, the ministers of one sect have not the right to meddle in the government of the others. Much more, in each particular communion, the ministers are independent of each other. It is in fact a Protestant principle that each one lawfully exercises the ministry, provided only that in its exercise he does not wander away from the doctrine of fundamental articles. But once again, as to those fundamental articles, who has the requisite authority to define

them? (See n. 315) Let us add, that according to Luther all the Faithful are priests. (See Janssen, vol. 2, p. 104.)

Who can fail to see the striking contrast between the Unity of Catholics on one side and the endless divisions of Protestants on the other? "At the present moment," says Mgr. J. S. Vaughan in *Thoughts for all Times*, "the Catholic Church, though spread throughout the entire world, remains ever one integral organic whole. And why is this? Because the self-same divine voice, that spoke through Peter in the council chamber of Jerusalem nearly two thousand years ago, still speaks through Leo XIII. All Catholics recognize him as the mouthpiece of the infinite God, and when he pronounces a decree or defines a doctrine, two hundred and fifty millions of loyal subjects bow in cheerful, grateful obedience before him, and accept his ruling and his authority. He watches over the whole flock. He has been appointed pastor by Christ Himself. All are bound to listen to him as to Christ in person, and who despises him, despises Christ (Luke x, 16).

When others are tossed about on the pathless sea of error, and are carried hither and thither by every wind of doctrine, we are at peace. What a contrast between the Church and the sects! Who but the stone-blind can fail to distinguish the work of God from the work of man?

What is the bond of union among Protestants? Where is their infallible authority? The Bible. But is the Bible, when left to each one's private interpretation, a principle of unity? History and experience prove it to be precisely the reverse. It is a most prolific principle of disunion, of discord and dissension. As soon as the principle was introduced, men split up into different sections, according to the different interpretations they gave the various passages. And when they differed among themselves, who was to settle their disputes and to adjust their difficulties? Who was to preserve unity? There was no one. They recognized no living infallible voice. Each felt himself to be as good a judge as his neighbor. What was the result? Chaos. In a word, endless divisions, and the formation of a heterogenous

assembly of persons known by the extraordinary name[1] of Protestants, not really united in one organic whole, but each following his own glimmering light—constituting an assemblage, to which courtesy extends the name of Church, but which is about as much like the Church of God as a heap of loose stones is like a cathedral."

§ II. Protestantism does not Possess the Mark of Holiness.

341. **A.** NOT IN ITS FOUNDERS. 1. History shows in Luther a violent, lustful, intemperate man, trampling under foot the most sacred engagements; in Calvin an impure man, cruel and vindictive; in Zwinglius a debauchee, as he himself confesses; in Henry VIII. an adulterer, a wife murderer and a ruthless tyrant. The morals and the private sentiments of Luther, such as he reveals himself in his writings, could not be published without scandal. The reader may read about his contests with the devil in Dollinger: "*The Reformation*," vol. 3, p. 257. The reader will also find very abundant, as well as fully authentic, information on the doings and morals of the German reformer in the "*Life of Martin Luther*," compiled from reliable sources by Rev. William Stang; Pustet, New York, 1897.

2. These reformers authorized in their adepts the most revolting things. Luther does not dare declare in his sermons that polygamy is forbidden; and he even went so far as to permit bigamy in the landgrave Philip of Hesse; seven other reformers approved this permission, and Melancthon assisted at this criminal union.

3. In their writings and speeches they displayed a passionate character, a corrupt heart and intolerable pride; the least resistance was enough to make them vomit forth torrents of insults and blasphemies; in this respect the language of Luther in particular is gross to so revolting a degree that it arouses unbearable disgust. (See Janssen and

[1]Webster defines *a Protestant*—"a Christian who protests against the doctrines and practices of the Roman Catholic Church." Can one conceive any form of religion more insane, empty and unattractive than one which is based and founded upon protests!

Audin, in the works already cited; see also in Chapter IV what we will have to say as to Protestant intolerance.

342. B. PROTESTANTISM DOES NOT POSSESS THE MARK OF HOLINESS IN ITS MORAL DOCTRINE. In the first place Protestantism does not possess a morality common to all and obligatory upon all, no more than it possesses a common belief binding upon all. For Protestantism the Scriptures are the sole rule of morals, as they are the sole rule of faith; now if every Protestant can and should interpret the Scriptures *according to the light of his reason*, each one may in consequence *form his own morality for himself*, without anyone else having the right to interfere. It is even permissible for everyone to *change his code of morality*, according to the ever-varying disposition of *his mind*. What I may think that I find in the Scriptures to-day, I may not find to-morrow, and my practice will change with my personal ideas.

Much more, if he believes the founders of the Reformation, the Protestant is not obliged to practice what he reads in the Scriptures even in the clearest passages. For these innovators assert that *good works are useless and even hurtful to salvation;* that *faith is sufficient* to make us friends of God; that man, once justified before God, is sure of salvation, *no matter what crimes he may afterwards commit;* that *it is even impossible for him to sin*, for the reason that he does no longer possess free-will. Luther and Calvin go so far as to *deny the very existence of free-will* in man; the former has even written a book entitled "*Servum Arbitrium*," that is to say, the serfdom or slavery of the will. The contents of this book may be summarized in the following phrase: "God performs in us evil as well as good, and as He saves us without merit on our part, so He damns us also without there being fault on our part. Everything that we do is done, not with freedom, but by pure necessity."—*Œvres de Luther* (Works of Luther), vol. II, p. 435.

Calvin uses the same language: "For incomprehensible reasons," says he, "God excites man to violate His laws; His inspirations impel towards evil the heart of the wicked; man falls into sin because God has so ordained."—*Institut.*

Chret. (Christian Institutions), vol. VII, ch. 23. "God," says Zwinglius, "is the first principle of sin. It is by a divine necessity that man commits all crimes."—*De Provid.*, vol. I, p. 355.

We shall give a few more texts taken from Luther's own writings, because they speak louder than all the arguments that might be adduced: "How rich is the Christian: even if he were to wish it, he cannot be disinherited from heaven by any sin whatsoever; not to believe in the Son of God, that is the only sin possible in this world. Believe, therefore, and be certain of thy salvation."—Luther, *de Captiv. Babyl.* "There is no scandal more dangerous, more poisonous, than a good life outwardly manifested by good works. Pious souls, who do good to gain heaven, not only shall never attain it, but they must be reckoned among the impious."—*Works of Luther*, vol. VI, p. 160. "The Gospel does not require of us works for our justification; on the contrary, it condemns such works." "Murder, theft, are not crimes as great as to wish to enter heaven with good works, than which nothing can be more prejudicial to salvation."—Unedited or Posthumous Sermons, published by Mack.

343. *The uselessness of good works*, also taught by Calvin in more than fifteen places in *Institution Chretienne*, naturally flows from the ideas which the innovators formed of justification. When man is justified, they say, no interior change takes place within him; all is summed up in a gratuitous and exterior imputation or application of the justice of Jesus Christ. The Christian becomes a just man because it pleases God to regard him as covered with the mantle of His Son's innocence. The morality of his conduct enters not at all in the conditions of the divine friendship; sin matters little, provided faith remains. "Be a sinner and sin greatly," Luther writes to his friend Melancthon. . . . "We must sin as long as we remain in this world. . . . Sin cannot separate us from God, even if we were each day to commit a thousand adulteries and as many homicides." Here is the Latin text of his words: "*Esto peccator et pecca fortiter*,

sed fortius fide et gaude in Christo qui victor est peccati, mortis et mundi. Peccandum est quandiu hic sumus. Sufficit quod agnovimus per divitias Dei Agnum qui tollit peccata mundi: ab hoc non avellet nos peccatum, etiamsi millies et millies uno die fornicemur et occidamus."—Lutheri ep. a Joh. aurifabro collata, Jena, 1556, vol. I, p. 545.

Such a doctrine evidently destroys the very principle of morality. If it were true, Jesus Christ, in place of having come into the world to deliver us from sin and teach us by word and example to practice all virtues, even the most heroic, would have died to give us the liberty to live in crime with impunity! [1]

344. C. PROTESTANTISM DOES NOT POSSESS THE MARK OF SANCTITY, in the influence which it has exercised upon morals. We can easily imagine to what extremes a doctrine will lead, which puts a cruel monster, such as Marat, and the saintly Vincent de Paul on the same level. Why should man inconvenience himself, why should he not give free rein to his passions? Hence we cannot be astonished that after only a few years, Calvin should write: "Among hundreds of persons calling themselves evangelicals, we can hardly find a single one, who has become an evangelical for other motive than to give himself up with the more freedom to all kinds of voluptuousness and incontinence." It was not long when Luther himself, becoming terrified at the fruits of his teaching, wrote: "Since Germany has seen the light of the Gospel, she appears as if possessed by the

[1] We are not ignorant of the fact that many Protestants of our day cannot tolerate the teachings of the Founders of the Reformation, and hold that the observance of the Decalogue is absolutely necessary for salvation. If, in their view, works are not the formal principle of justification, they are none the less a necessary condition, because they show a true belief, which really justifies. This attitude of many modern Protestants would simply prove that their principles and conduct are in direct opposition to those of their Founders. But would this prove that the Religion, they received from those Founders, is identical with the doctrine of Jesus Christ? And that they may conscientiously continue until death to profess the Creed of those Reformers? Having been compelled by the voice of reason and the testimony of an upright conscience to abandon the reformers' teachings in the capital points referred to above, (nos. 342, 343) how can they safely trust to their guidance in any thing else?

devil; . . . the fear of God has disappeared; it is a deluge of all kinds of vices." (Comment in II Petri 2.) "Our people take the Gospel for a gastronomic doctrine, which teaches to drink and eat to the verge of bursting. This is the view of the matter now held by everybody. Who among us would have undertaken to preach it, if we had forseen so many calamities and scandals? Now that we have begun, we must stand the consequences."—(Works of Luther; ed. of Walch, Halle, 1737-53.) "I admit," says he in another place, "that my doctrine has given birth to many scandals. I will not deny that the new order of things often makes me tremble, especially when my conscience reproaches me with having raised my arm against the order of the Church that was so quiet, so peaceful under the Papacy, and with having, by my doctrines, given birth to discord and trouble." (Luther's works, v. 2, p. 387.) See Lacordaire, 23d Confer.

These admissions, which we could multiply tenfold, and which can be found in Janssen's work, "*Germany and the Reformation*," show that God was not with the men who pretended to *reform* the Roman Church. Whilst, from the very beginning, the reformed sects incurred these bitter and well deserved reproaches, the Fathers of the Council of Trent, assisted by the Holy Ghost, were, by rules full of wisdom and prudence, remedying effectually the abuses which had been introduced into Catholic discipline. See in the work of Janssen the part entitled, "Luther judged by himself," vol. 2, p. 182.

References: 1. Cobbett, "The Protestant Reformation, the First Ten Letters."

2. Mgr. Segur, "Plain Talk about the Protestantism of To-day," p. 76-81.

3. Balmes, "Protestantism and Catholicity Compared, etc." John Murphy and Co., Baltimore, 1854, ch. 24, 26, 30.

4. Alfred Young (priest of the Congregation of St. Paul), "Catholic and Protestant Countries Compared," The Catholic Book Exchange, New York, 1895.

§ III. Protestantism Does not Possess the Mark of Catholicity.

345. It is clearly evident that Protestantism does not possess universality, either in *time* or *space*. In the first place, it only began in the XVI. century; then, in the countries, where it succeeded in introducing itself, even if it does bear a general name, it is in reality divided into a multitude of sects perfectly independent of and hostile to each other, separated even by their particular name, having often no other bond than their common hatred of the Catholic Church. How could they form *one* religion, when there is not and there cannot be any body of truths uniformly taught everywhere among them? Uniformity of belief would indeed be the overthrow of the fundamental principle of Protestantism: the Bible freely interpreted by each individual. Finally, not only none of the divisions of Protestants approaches the Catholic Church in numbers, but the total number of the adherents of all the reformed sects is far from reaching the number of Catholics throughout the world. (See n. 323.) The following anecdote taken from the lecture of T. W. M. Marshall, entitled "Order and Chaos," will be read with interest and supply the answer to a common difficulty alleged by Protestants against Catholics:

"Some years ago, I was present officially at the examination of an English primary school, in which the children displayed such unusual accuracy and intelligence, as long as the questions turned only upon secular subjects, that I was anxious to ascertain whether they could reason as well about the truths of the Catechism, as they could about those of grammar and arithmetic. I communicated my desire to their clergyman, who kindly permitted me to have recourse to a test which I had employed on other occasions. I requested him to interrogate them on the Notes of the Church, and when they had explained in the usual manner the meaning of the word Catholic, I took up the examination, with the consent of the priest, and addressed the fol-

lowing question to the class: 'You say the Church is Catholic because she is everywhere. Now I have visited many countries, in all parts of the world, and I never came to one in which I did not find heresy. If, then, the Church is Catholic because she is everywhere, why is not heresy Catholic, since heresy is everywhere also?' 'If you please, sir,' answered a little girl about twelve years of age, 'the Church is everywhere, and everywhere the *same*; heresy may be everywhere too, as you say, but it is everywhere *different*.'

I related this incident not long after, as a proof that faith is an intellectual power, to one of the greatest lawyers in England, a man accustomed to appraise all the products of the human intellect. He declared to me his opinion that it was the most astonishing answer ever made by a child. He was wrong. I have myself heard similar answers a hundred times. And you, ladies and gentlemen, will certainly not share the surprise of this eminent lawyer, because you know that a little Catholic child, who has learned the Catechism, and nothing else, is a truer and deeper philosopher, in the sight of God and the angels, than all the Pagan sages of the past, or all the Protestant doctors of the present."

References: 1. "Catholic, an Essential and Exclusive Attribute of the Roman Church," by Mgr. Capel; Pustet & Co., New York.

2. "Is One Religion as Good as Another?" by the Rev. John McLaughlin. Benziger Brothers, New York, 1891; chap. 2, "Universality or Catholicity."

3. "The True Faith of Our Forefathers," by a Professor of Theology in Woodstock College, S. J., Maryland; ch. iv, "Catholicity."

§ IV. Protestantism does not Possess the Mark of Apostolicity.

346. **A.** IT DOES NOT POSSESS IT BY ITS DOCTRINE. We have abundantly proven this fact. Where is the apostolic doctrine enjoined upon the belief of all? Evidently

the Apostles did not receive from Jesus Christ, nor did they transmit to their successors, all the various and often contradictory opinions, which divide Protestant sects.

B. NOR DOES PROTESTANTISM POSSESS THE MARK OF APOSTOLICITY BY ITS GOVERNMENT OR ITS MINISTRY. How could the Founders of Protestantism derive their authority from the Apostles, when they themselves rebelled against the *successors* of the Apostles? In truth, Luther, Calvin and the other leaders of Protestantism, feeling the necessity of justifying their revolt, claimed to have received from the Apostles their mission as Reformers; but to prove to the world that they have been authorized to change or perfect a divine work, something more is required than a mere assertion. Jesus Christ Himself thought it necessary to give abundant proofs of His divine mission. Hence the Reformers should have offered at least some miracles to accredit themselves before the people. Luther understood very well the necessity, that there was, to furnish such a proof. Hence arose great embarrassment in his mind. Sometimes he would say that he held his mission from the magistrates of Wittemberg, at others, from his position as a Doctor. In the space of twenty-four years he changed his opinion fourteen times on that point. See Dollinger: "*The Reformation*," vol. 3, translated by Perrot, p. 199.

The truth is that no one has received and no one shall ever receive such a mission; that of reforming Divine Revelation: we have seen that the Apostles had expressedly received the command to teach men to keep what Jesus Christ had confided to them; and St. Paul launched forth anathemas against any man who would dare teach another doctrine than that of the Apostles. It remains, therefore, proven, that it was by their private individual authority that these men arrogated to themselves their pretended mission, and that the Church of Jesus Christ has the right to say to them: "You are but of yesterday and I know you not."

As to the Anglicans, it is certain that their church possesses neither the power of orders nor the power of jurisdic-

tion.[1] We have seen that jurisdiction is transmitted by the authority which is invested with it, and in accordance with the canonical rules in force at the time of its transmission. To whom then do Protestant ministers succeed? From whom and how have they received jurisdiction? Surely it could not be from their first bishops, who abandoned Catholicity to embrace the Reformation. These bishops before their apostacy, it is true, held jurisdiction from the Church of Rome. But the subjects, which Rome had confided to them, Rome took away from them; it had the right to do the one thing as well as the other.

Conclusion. Protestantism therefore has *none of the characteristic* notes by which the Saviour has marked His work; hence it is not the edifice built by the divine hand to shelter the elect during their passage from earth to heaven, from time to eternity. When treating of the Divinity of the Christian religion, in the first part of our work, we have shown (n. 211) that a miracle is an authentic divine confirmation of the doctrine, in support of which it is performed. It has also been proved that Jesus Christ and the Apostles performed many such miracles. Here we may pertinently ask: Have the Founders and apostles of Protestantism any such credentials to show? We know from history the fraudulent attempt made by Calvin to work a miracle, the resurrection of a dead man, as an evidence of God's sanction and approval of the reformed Gospel he was preaching, an attempt which had a tragic end, and whose fatal termination publicly exposed the imposture of that would-be wonderworker. As this historical fact cannot but convey to our readers a most salutary and instructive les-

1 See the Apostolic Letter of Leo XIII., dated September, 1895, on the nullity or invalidity of Anglican ordinations. This letter, in which the Holy Father sets forth most convincing reasons for his final judgment, put an end, as far as Catholics were concerned, to the discussion as to the value of these ordinations. May our separated brethren be impressed with the persuasion that they have neither priesthood, nor sacrifice, nor the Real Presence of Jesus Christ, nor the power of imparting valid absolution! May they respond to the pressing appeal of the Supreme Pastor of souls, and return at last to the center of Catholic unity, where they will find one fold under one shepherd.

son, we reproduce it here at full length, and with all the circumstances and details attested by those that were present at its occurrence:

The Archheretic Calvin's Miracle.

Jerome Bolsec, a contemporary and disciple of Calvin, but later on a convert to the Catholic faith, in his life of Calvin, ch. 13, relates the following fact, which we translate from the original Latin, as found in Card. Bellarmine's "Controversies," vol. 2d, p. 103.

"I must not omit," says Bolsec, "his wily proceedings to obtain for himself the credit of a holy prophet of God and worker of miracles, by pretending to raise from the dead a man by the name of Bruleus, native of Ostunum. It happened as follows: Bruleus and his wife, having moved from Ostunum to Geneva, were seeking to gain the favor of Calvin in order to get a portion of the money entrusted to him for the benefit of the poor. Calvin kindly promises them assistance, if they will not refuse him their co-operation in carrying out a certain plan, for the success of which fidelity and silence were absolutely required. They, in turn, profess themselves ready to execute his commands. Calvin then instructs Bruleus to feign himself sick. The ministers in a meeting exhort the people to aid the sick man by prayers, and relieve his poverty with alms. Not long after he simulates death. Whereupon Calvin, secretly advised of it, goes out for a walk, as if entirely ignorant of the whole affair. Accompanied by a great crowd of his friends and followers he comes to the place, where he could hear the cries and lamentations of the wife, for she acted to perfection the part of one stricken in sorrow and grief. Calvin asks what is the matter, enters the house and falls on his knees, together with all his retinue, and praying out loud entreats God to show his power and restore the dead man to life and thus make it evident to the whole people that he (i. e. Calvin) was God's special and beloved servant, and singularly chosen by Him for the ministry of the Gospel and the reformation of the Church. After uttering these prayers he approaches the corpse, and taking hold of

the wretched man's hand, bids him in God's name arise. He repeats again, and a third time the same words, even raising his voice higher. But what happens? The dead man neither hears nor speaks, nor stirs, for, by a just judgment of God, who hates deceptions, impostors and lies, he that pretended to be dead, is found to be actually so. And the wife, however much she shook him and stirred him, could not make him speak or move, for he was indeed stiff and cold in death. Perceiving this she began to weep and lament in good earnest, and turning upon Calvin, called him impostor, murderer, assassin, who had killed her husband, and in a loud voice related the whole affair from beginning to end, thus publicly exposing the fraud of the wily Reformer; and the same writer, Jerome Bolsec, concludes his narrative by the following words: "Let the cringing slaves and disciples of Calvin deny this fact, it they can. This tragic event was a matter of public notoriety in Geneva, where it occurred; it was testified to by many eyewitnesses, and confirmed by one of the accomplices of the fraud, the wife of the wretched dead impostor himself. As Tertullian (A. D. 240) in his work—De Præscrip—pertinently remarks, "Apostolic men raised the dead to life; —impostors cause the living to die—Illi enim de mortuis suscitabant: isti de vivis mortuos faciunt.

§ V. In its Rule of Faith Protestantism Contradicts Jesus Christ.

347. There is still another way of putting in its true light all the falsity of Protestantism; it is to show that *its rule of faith* is also absolutely inadmissible and contrary to the will of Jesus Christ. This *basis* once *overthrown*, the *whole edifice* of the innovators of the XVI. century falls to the ground.

The Bible, *nothing but the Bible freely interpreted by each individual*, this was at the beginning, this still is the rule of faith of all true Protestants, that is to say, the principle which determines their belief.

"In order to know the religion of Protestants," says

Chillingworth, "neither the doctrine of Luther, nor that of Calvin, or Melancthon, is to be taken, nor the Confession of Augsburg or Geneva, nor the Catechism of Heidelberg, nor the Articles of the Anglican Church, nor even the harmony of all the Protestant confessions, but that which they all subscribe to, as the perfect rule of their faith and actions, that is to say, the Bible. Yes, the Bible, THE BIBLE ALONE, IS THE RELIGION OF PROTESTANTS."—Vide "The Religion of Protestants, a sure Road to Salvation," by Dr. Chillingworth. (Ch. vi, 56.)

We Catholics also profess the greatest respect for the *Sacred Scriptures*; but these Scriptures we receive from the hands of the Church, who *through her infallible authority* establishes the canon or authentic catalogue of the sacred books and guarantees *their divine inspiration.* Moreover, we receive from the same hand and with the same veneration, Tradition, that is to say, the word of God not contained in the Sacred Books. Finally, far from claiming, as Protestants do, that everyone has the right to determine for himself the meaning of Scripture, far from proclaiming each man the judge and arbiter of his belief, we say, on the contrary, that it is to the Church, assisted by the Holy Ghost, that belongs the right to *determine the meaning* of the Sacred text as well as to interpret *Tradition* in an infallible manner. In a word, our rule of faith is the doctrinal authority of the Church, her living and infallible teaching. Therefore the Catholic principle differs *radically* and *substantially* from the rule of faith devised by the Protestant Reformers. In place of the Bible, and the Bible exclusively interpreted by private judgment, the Catholic rule is this: The written and unwritten Word of God taught and interpreted by the Pastors of the Church in harmony and communion with the Apostolic See.

THESIS—THE RULE OF FAITH OF PROTESTANTS CANNOT BE ADMITTED.

348. FIRST ARGUMENT. This rule of faith is *contrary to the will and provision of Jesus Christ, and condemned by the Sacred Scriptures themselves.*

a. In order to remain faithful to their rule of faith, Protestants should prove to us, by formal texts of the Bible itself, that the Apostles *received from the Divine Master the order to put into writing* the teachings falling from His lips. Far from being able to do this, they read, as we do in the Bible, that after having founded His Church on Peter and the twelve Apostles, He did not say to them: Go and distribute Bibles, but He said: "Going therefore teach ye all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you, and behold I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world. Go ye into the whole world and preach the Gospel to every creature." (Matt. xxviii, 19, 20. Mark xvi, 15.)

b. Giving the example by His own acts, Jesus Christ *preached*, but He wrote nothing; nowhere do we find that He taught anything by writing and much less *exclusively* by writing. "Christ," says St. John Chrysostom, "did not leave a single writing to His Apostles; in place of books, He promised them the Holy Ghost. 'It is he,' Jesus says, 'that will inspire to you what you shall say.' (Matth. x, 19, 20.)

c. The Apostles, to whom Jesus Christ promised that the Holy Ghost would recall to them everything that He had taught them, have done what their Master commanded them to do. It was only later and incidentally that some of them have written anything. The other Apostles wrote nothing, and yet they converted entire nations. It is *by preaching* that they propagated the Faith throughout the world. It was only at the end of the first century, about sixty-seven years after the death of Christ that the composition of the New Testament was finished. The Faithful, therefore, according to the Protestant principle, had no rule of faith for many long years!

d. Moreover, the sacred writers constantly allude to oral teaching. Take as instances in point two remarkable conversions related by St. Luke in the Acts of the Apostles,

that of St. Paul and of the eunuch of Candace, Queen of the Ethiopians. In both cases oral teaching is prescribed by the Lord Himself, as the means of imparting to them the divine gift of the knowledge of Christian faith.

"And he (Saul) trembling and astonished said: Lord, what wilt thou have me to do? And the Lord said to him: Arise and go into the city; and there it shall be told thee what thou must do." (Acts ii, 6, 7.)

"And he (the eunuch) was returning sitting in his chariot, and reading Isaias the prophet. And the Spirit said to Philip: Go near and join thyself to that chariot. And Philip running thither, heard him reading the prophet Isaias, and he said: Thinkest thou that thou understandest what thou readest? And he said: How can I unless some one show me? And he ordered Philip to come up and sit with him." (Acts viii, 28-31.) The same inspired writers explicitly declare that they have put in writing only a very small part of the teachings of the Saviour (John xx, 30, 31, xxi, 25); and they recommend the Faithful to have the same respect for what they, the Apostles, have taught by word of mouth as for that which they have taught in their writings. St. Paul writes to the Thessalonians: "Therefore, brethren, stand fast; and hold the traditions, which you have learned by word or by our epistle." (II Thes. ii, 14.) And to Timothy: "And the things which thou hast heard from me before many witnesses, the same commend to faithful men who shall be fit to teach others also." (II Tim. ii, 2.) Who does not know that it is by means of tradition that we know of the substitution of Sunday for Saturday, of the validity of baptism conferred by heretics, and of the lawfulness of baptism administered to infants? If there is in the Church a sure and invariable rule, followed by all the Fathers, proclaimed by all the Councils, observed by all the Doctors, it is most assuredly faithfully to follow the command so often repeated by St. Paul: "Keep the deposit," that is, as St. Vincent of Lerins says, "keep not what you yourselves have discovered, but what was confided to you, what you have received through

others, and not what you had to find yourselves; a thing which one does not find in his mind, but which one learns from those who preceded him; which it is not permitted to establish by private effort, but which you must have received from hand to hand, by public tradition, and of which you must not be the author, but the guardian."

349. SECOND ARGUMENT. This rule of Faith is condemned by what we learn from the *history of the Church.* According to St. Irenæus (A. D. 202), there was already in his time "a multitude of uncivilized people, who believed in Jesus Christ, without paper and without ink." These countries had no Sacred Scriptures, and yet the same Saint states, they preserved the Faith pure and intact by means of tradition.

Do we see anywhere in the history of later times that the ministers of the Church carried with them loads of books, and that these books were distributed before their preaching? Moreover, how would this have been possible, before the invention of printing, that is to say, during fourteen centuries, when copies of the Bible were scarce and very expensive? During all this long period the immense majority of the Faithful had nothing to instruct them but the oral and traditional teachings of the ministers of the Church. Were not these men Christians?

From what we have said it evidently follows that the Church was founded *without* the Bible and that she existed *before* the Bible. The Gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, the Epistles and the Apocalypse did not make the Christian communities or the Church, for those writings were addressed to communities already formed and fully organized. It is therefore with perfect reason that St. Augustine has said that he would not believe in the Gospel, if the authority of the Catholic Church did not decide him to do so: *Ego Evangelio non crederem, nisi me Catholicæ Ecclesiæ commoveret auctoritas.*

350. THIRD ARGUMENT. In any event, if the Bible, freely interpreted by everybody, were the only rule of faith, *the great mass of mankind* could not, even in our day, at-

tain the faith necessary for salvation, for there is a great number of them who cannot read, and others, absorbed in the labor of their hands, have not the time to do so. And yet, according to the Protestant theory, it is necessary that every man should assure himself, by his own study, of the inspiration of the Bible, of its authenticity and completeness, of the fidelity of the version placed in his hands and of the true sense of each verse. If God had given the Bible as the rule of faith; if, as the Protestants would have it, He had made a law obligatory on all Christians to read the Bible themselves, He would thereby have made entrance into the Church and eternal salvation impossible to the immense majority of mankind, and especially to the poor. Now, Jesus has made precisely the evangelization of the poor one of the marks of His divine mission. (Luke iv, 18; vii, 22.)

351. FOURTH ARGUMENT. Without *the authority of the Church* it would be impossible to fix the *Canon* or authentic catalogue of the inspired books of Holy Scripture, and to propose to the belief of the Faithful a complete body of doctrine absolutely and permanently determined. The study of the books themselves, the testimony of history, the substantially identical readings of different manuscripts, in a word, criticism cannot determine the canon of the inspired books with sufficient certitude to render an act of divine faith possible. Have we not seen Protestants, under the pretext of modern higher criticism, reject one after another several books of the Old and of the New Testament, and even deny altogether the divine inspirations of the Scriptures?[1]

[1] It is known that Protestants reproach the Catholic Church for not allowing indifferently to all the Faithful the reading of the Bible. But it is precisely because the Waldenses, the Albigenses and especially Protestants, have made an abusive use of sacred texts, and that the latter have inundated the world with *falsified* Bibles, that the Church, to preserve her flock, has felt herself obliged to put wise restrictions upon the reading of the Sacred Scriptures. These restrictions, let us carefully remember, apply only to the Bible *translated unto the vulgar tongues.*

The recent Apostolic Constitution of Leo XIII, dated February, 1897, forbids the reading without authorization, of "all versions in

References: 1. "Catholicity, Protestantism and Infidelity," by Fr. X. Weninger, S. J.; Benziger Brothers, New York, 1871, section ii, p. 163-181.

2. The Lenten Lectures of Rev. Thomas Maguire, Christian Press Association, New York, Lect. i, ii, iii, iv.

3. "The Faith of Catholics," vol. 1, The Rule of Faith —The Church is the divinely authorized Expounder of the Scriptures. Private Judgment.

4. The Tablet, Baltimore, May, 1902. Bible number, an excellent production on this important subject.

5. "Where is the Church?" by the Rev. Charles Coupe, S. J. Catholic Truth Society, London; lecture iv.

6. "The Bible and its Interpreter," by Rev. I. H. Casey, S. J., Professor of Dogmatic Theology in Woodstock College, Md. John Jos. McVey, Philadelphia, 1900. Part I. The Right of Private Judgment. A very able statement and development of the question at issue.

7. "La Questione Biblica e L'Enciclica," Providentissimus Deus di S. S. Leone XIII, per Salvatore Brandi, S. J.

To complete our demonstration of Article III, in which we prove that Protestantism does not possess the notes or marks of the true Church of Christ, we add the following documents, which our readers will peruse with profit. They are quoted by his grace Bede Vaughan, late Archbishop of Sydney, Australia, in his Advent Conferences:

"Father Jones' Epitome of Milner's views regarding the principle of private judgment and the Bible only, may not

native languages, even those published by Catholics, if they have not been approved by the Apostolic See, or edited under the supervision of the Bishops, with notes taken from the Fathers of the Church and learned Catholic writers." There are other reproaches and accusations, which Protestants, ill-instructed or imbued with prejudices, are in the habit of making, for instance, that Catholics are obliged to believe all the wild fancies and reveries, which it might please the Pope to publish; that we *adore* the Saints, their images and relics; that worship consists with us in outward ceremonies; that to obtain pardon of our sins it is sufficient to receive absolution; that with money we may redeem all our sins. We shall not notice them; they are groundless accusations, absurdities and puerilities that any Catholic, in the least way instructed as to his religion, can easily refute.

be altogether useless to those who wish for a concise and clear exposition of this strange religious fallacy.

CHURCH OF ENGLAND'S FALLACIOUS RULE OF FAITH.

The *Rule of Faith*, adopted by the Church of England, and by other classes of Protestants, is the *written Word of God*, or the *Bible alone, according as it is understood by each particular person.*[1] That this is not the *True Rule of Faith*, I shall prove, chiefly, by means of two of the maxims already laid down, namely: *The Rule of Faith appointed by Christ must be* CERTAIN *and* UNERRING; *that is to say, it must be one which is not liable to lead any rational and sincere inquirer into inconsistency or error.* Secondly, *this Rule must be* UNIVERSAL; *that is to say, it must be proportioned to the abilities and circumstances of the great bulk of mankind.*

I begin by observing, that if Christ had intended that all mankind should learn His religion from a *Book*, namely, the *New Testament*, He Himself would have written that Book, and would have enjoined the obligation of learning to read it: whereas, it does not appear that He ever wrote any thing at all, unless perhaps the sins of the Pharisees with his finger upon the dust. (John viii, 6.) It does not even appear that He gave his Apostles any command to *write* the Gospel; though He emphatically commanded them to *preach* it (Matt. x), and that to all the nations of the earth. (Matt. xxviii.) In this ministry they all spent their lives *preaching* the Religion of Christ in every country, from Judea to Spain in one direction, and to India in another; everywhere establishing Churches, and *commending their doctrine to faithful men who should be fit to teach others also.*

[1] Although this is the professed Rule of Protestants, yet, if we strictly examine, we shall find that very many Protestants do not really form their Creed by this Rule alone. They receive their first religious ideas from the lessons and example of their Parents or Masters or Tutors, or from the instructions of their Ministers, or from the Catechisms or Creeds which they learn in their early youth. The ideas they draw from these sources remain fixed in their minds, and direct them in afterwards reading the Scripture, and determining its sense. They find in the Scripture what their first impressed ideas lead them to expect to find there. Their early impressions become the real Rule of their belief.

(II Tim. ii, 2.) Only *a part* of them *wrote* anything; and what these did write, was, for the most part, addressed to particular persons or congregations, and on particular occasions. The Evangelists were moved by the Holy Ghost to write their respective Gospels; nevertheless there is nothing in the Gospels which indicates that any one of them, or all of them together, contain an *entire, detailed, and clear* exposition of the Religion of Jesus Christ. The Canonical Epistles show the particular occasions on which they were written, and thus prove, as a Protestant Bishop observes, that, 'they are not to be considered as regular treatises on the Christian Religion.'[1]

Again, in supposing our Saviour to have appointed His bare *written* word for the *Rule of our Faith*, without any authorized judge to decide on the unavoidable controversies growing out of it, we must suppose Him to have acted differently from what common sense has dictated to all other legislators. For, where do we read of a legislator, who, after dictating a code of laws, neglected to appoint judges and magistrates, to decide their meaning, and to enforce obedience to the decision? 'It were better,' says the illustrious Fenelon, alluding to the Protestant *Rule*, 'to live without any law, than to have laws, which all men might interpret according to their several opinions and interests.'

In fact, the method of determing religious questions by *Scripture only, according to each individual's interpretation*, must naturally produce, and always has produced, whenever and wherever it has been adopted, endless and incurable religious differences, and of course *errors*; because truth is *one*. It is liable to produce such differences, because the Scripture is open to all interpretations, however varying or contradictory. It cannot, of itself, decide controversies of religion, since it remains a dead letter under every interpretation. It remains always true in itself; but it is silent as to the truth or falsehood of any interpretation. That it has produced such differences, the records of history and our own observation bear witness. 'See,' says St.

[1] Elem. of Chris. Rel, v. l, p. 277.

Augustine, 'into how many morsels those are divided, who have divided themselves from the unity of the Church.' 'It is natural' says Tertullian, 'for error to be ever changing. The 'diciples have the same right in this matter as their masters had.'

To speak now only of the Protestant Reformers, no sooner had their leader, Martin Luther, set up the tribunal of private judgment on the sense of Scripture, in opposition to the authority of the Church ancient and modern, than his disciples, proceeding on his own principle, undertook to prove from the same Scripture that his own doctrine was erroneous, and that the Reformation itself wanted reforming. Carlostad, Zuinglius, Œcolompadius, Muncer, and a hundred more of his followers, wrote and preached against him, and against each other, with the utmost virulence; still each of them equally claiming the sanction of the Scripture—thus making the Word of eternal Truth contradict itself in the contradictory doctrines which they deduced from it; while they acknowledged no authority that could compose their differences, or rectify their errors. In vain did Luther claim a superiority over them; in vain did he denounce hell against them; in vain did he threaten to return to the Catholic Church. He had put the Bible into each man's hand, to explain it for himself; and this his followers continued to do in open defiance of him, till their mutual contradictions and discords became so numerous and scandalous, as to overwhelm the thinking part of them with grief and confusion.[1] 'Our people,' writes one of them, 'are carried away with every wind of doctrine. There is not one point which is not held by some of them as an arti-

[1] Even Luther acted against himself in a material point.—In his Bull against the *falsely called Order of Bishops*, he said, "whoever support the government of Bishops, and willingly obey them, are ministers of Satan." Notwithstanding this, he afterwards himself undertook to consecrate Amsdorf Bishop of Naumburg. *Sleidon comment. l.* 14. He even threatened to contradict all that he had before either written or said. "If," he said to some other Reformers, who had acted without his authority, "if you continue to bring about your design by these common deliberations, I will fairly tack about, and recall all that I have either written or said. Take this for a warning," *Tom* 7, *fol.* 275.

cle of faith, and by others as an impiety.'[1] The same language may, with equal truth, be applied to every period of the Reformation; it may, with peculiar propriety, be applied to our days, and to our country, divided as it is by countless and ever-varying sects, while all, contradicting each other, confidently appeal to the same Sacred Scripture. I would here ask, how can Protestants seriously believe, that *Scripture privately interpreted* can be a secure *Rule*, unless each one, even the most ignorant, can be certain that he understands the Scripture in its *right sense*? And how can each Protestant be certain that he understands it in its *right sense*, while around him he finds so many others, who claim an equal right of judging with himself, understanding it in various and contradictory senses; all differing from his own? 'The Gospel,' as St. Jerome observes, 'consists not in the words, but in the sense. A wrong explanation turns the Word of God into the word of man.'[2]

Nor has the unbounded license of explaining Scripture, each one in his own way, which Protestants claim, been confined in its effects to mere errors and dissensions. It has caused also mutual persecutions and bloodshed; it has produced tumults, rebellions and anarchy beyond recounting. Luther formed a league of Princes and States in Germany against the Emperor, which desolated the Empire for more than a century. His disciples, Muncer and Stork, taking advantage of the pretended *evangelical liberty* which he taught, claimed, at the head of forty thousand Anabaptists, the empire and possession of the world; and this because they were, so they said, the *meek ones who were to possess the land* (Matt. v, 4), and sought to enforce their demands with fire and sword. Zuinglius lighted up a similar flame throughout Switzerland. Dr. Hay asserts that 'the misinterpretation of Scripture brought on the miseries of the Civil War;' and Lord Clarendon, and other writers, show that there was not a crime committed by the Puritan rebels, in the course of it, which they did not profess to justify by texts and instances drawn from the sacred volumes.

1 Dutith, Epist. ad Capiton.
2 In Ep. ad Galat.

We see then, to what endless dissensions, errors, and even crimes, the principle of *Private Interpretation of Scripture*, no less than that of supposed *Private Inspiration*, has conducted men, and of course is ever liable to conduct them. This therefore proves, according to the self-evident maxim stated above, that *Scripture privately interpreted* cannot be the *Rule* which is to bring us to religious truth. Dr. Whitaker, though a Protestant, acknowledges that 'the private interpretation of Scripture *must* be uncertain, and therefore *may* be false.' Now it would be no less than blasphemy to say that Christ established, as a *Rule* of religious faith, that which was liable to lead astray those who should follow it.

Again, according to another evident maxim before laid down, this cannot be the *right Rule*, because it cannot be *universal* in its application. Even if it were in itself (which we have seen it is not) a sufficient and safe *Rule*, still it is obviously not adapted to the great bulk of mankind, in all their various circumstances. How *very large* a proportion of mankind, of the different ages and countries since the time of Christ, have not been able to read? Of those who have been able to read, how few, comparatively, have been able to obtain copies of the Bible, more especially before the invention of printing? And of those who have been able to obtain and read the Bible, how few could have leisure and capability to examine, and compare, the various parts of this sacred, sublime, and mysterious Volume, to reconcile apparent contradictions, to ascertain what was intended for example and what only as narrative, what was to be understood literally and what figuratively? It must follow then, that the *Rule of Scripture alone* could not have been the *Rule* established by Christ, since by establishing such a *Rule* He would have excluded vast multitudes of mankind, throughout the world, from the means of arriving at the knowledge of His truths.

Thus (to repeat in a few words the substance of this discussion), we find, when we take a view of the general circumstances of mankind, that few, comparatively, could make use of the *Rule* in question; and, on the other hand, we

have seen that those who could make and have made use of it, have been led by it into pernicious and endless contradictions, dissensions, errors, and impieties.

After considering all this, let those who adhere to this *Rule* here ask themselves candidly and seriously, whether they can still reasonably believe that a *Rule*, thus limited and uncertain, can be the *Rule* which Christ established to direct the faith and conduct of his followers? Let them seriously reflect that there are in Scripture, as the Scripture itself affirms, *things hard to be understood, which the unlearned and the unstable wrest to their own destruction.* (II Pet. iii, 16.) 'Let them open their Bibles,' to use the words of a very learned Protestant, 'take the first page that occurs in either Testament, and say without disguise, is there nothing in it too hard for their understanding?'[1] Let them listen to the words and follow the counsel of St. Augustine: 'If you think you have been sufficiently tossed about, and wish to see an end to your anxieties, follow the RULE OF CATHOLIC DISCIPLINE, which has come down to us through the Apostles from Christ Himself, and which shall descend from us to the latest posterity.'[2]

The following is a declaration made by the Catholic Bishops, the Vicars Apostolic, and their Coadjutors, in Great Britain, November, 1838, with regard to the old charge of the Church being an *enemy to the reading and circulating* of the Holy Scriptures.

ON THE HOLY SCRIPTURES.

"In England the Catholic Church is held out *as an enemy to the reading and circulating of the Holy Scriptures.*

Whereas the Catholic Church venerates the Holy Scriptures as the written part of the Word of God; she has in all ages been the faithful guardian of this Sacred deposit; she has ever labored to preserve the integrity of these inspired writings, and the true sense in which they have been universally understood at all times from the Apostolic age.

The Catholic Church has never forbidden or discouraged

1 Balgny's Discourses, p. 133.

2 De Utilit. Cred. c, 8.

the reading or the circulation of authentic copies of the Sacred Scriptures, in the original languages. She binds her clergy to the daily recital of a Canonical office, which comprises a large portion of the Sacred Volume, and to read and expound to the faithful, in the vernacular tongue, on Sundays, the Epistle or Gospel of the day, or some other portion of the divine law.

As to translations of the Holy Scriptures into modern languages, the Catholic Church requires that none should be put into the hands of the faithful but such as are acknowledged by ecclesiastical authority to be accurate and conformable to the sense of the originals. There never was a general law of the Catholic Church prohibiting the reading of authorized translations of the Scriptures; but, considering that many, by their ignorance and evil dispositions, have perverted the meaning of the sacred text to their own destruction, the Catholic Church has thought it prudent to make a regulation, that the faithful should be guided in this matter by the advice of their respective Pastors.....

The Catholics in England, of mature years, have permission to read authentic and approved translations of the Holy Scriptures, with explanatory notes, and are exhorted to read them in the spirit of piety, humility and obedience.

Pope Pius VII., in a Rescript dated April 18, 1820, and addressed to the Vicars Apostolic in England, earnestly exhorts them to confirm the people committed to their spiritual care, in faith and good works; and for that end, to encourage them to read books of pious instruction, and particularly the Holy Scriptures, in translations approved by ecclesiastical authority; because, to those who are well disposed, nothing can be more useful, more consoling, or more animating than the reading of the Sacred Scriptures, understood in their true sense—they serve to confirm the faith, to support the hope, and to inflame the charity of the true Christian.

But when, according to the Protestant system, the reading and the circulation of the Scriptures are urged and recommended as the entire rule of faith, as the sole means by

which men are to be brought to the certain and specific knowledge of the doctrines, precepts and institutions of Christ; and when the Scriptures, so read and circulated, are left to the interpretation and private judgment of each individual; then such reading, circulation and interpretation are forbidden by the Catholic Church, because the Catholic Church knows that the circulation of the Scriptures, and the interpretation of them by each one's private judgment, was not the means ordained by Christ for the communication of the true knowledge of His law to all nations—she knows that Christianity was established in many countries before one book of the New Testament was written—that it was not by means of the Scriptures that the Apostles and their successors converted nations, or any one nation to the unity of the Christian faith—that the unauthorized reading and circulation of the Scriptures, and the interpretation of them by private judgment, are calculated to lead men to contradictory doctrines on the primary articles of Christian belief; to inconsistent forms of worship, which cannot all be constituent parts of the uniform and sublime system of Christianity; to errors and fanaticism in religion and to seditions and the greatest disorders in states and kingdoms."

"But we are assured that Luther and Tyndal and others first made the Bible known. Is not this another calumny of our accusers, another perversion of the plainest history? Let us break it to pieces.

Was there absolutely no Bible in the world, or nothing done in the way of publishing, between the date of the invention of printing and Luther's production of his translation? On the contrary, we know from historical records that before the first Protestant version saw the light, the Catholic Church had already sent out eighty-four editions of the Scriptures, sixty-two in Hebrew and twenty-two in Greek. That in the Latin tongue—the common language of the learned—she had sent out three hundred and forty-three editions, of which one hundred and forty-eight were of the entire Bible, sixty-two of the New Testament and one hun-

dred and thirty-three of separate books. But they were for the learned? Perhaps the people were forbidden to read the book? This also is as stupid a calumny as all the rest. One hundred and ninety-eight editions of the Scriptures were published for the people in the common tongue before Luther's book had been dreamt of. There were one hundred and four editions of the whole Bible. Of these twenty were in Italian, twenty-six in French, nineteen in Flemish, two Spanish, six Bohemian, one Sclavonic, and thirty in German. In all, including the Polyglot, six hundred and twenty-six editions of the Bible and portions of the Bible, in which one hundred and ninety-eight were in the language of the laity, had issued from the press with the sanction and at the instance of the Church, in the countries where she reigned supreme, before the first Protestant version of the Scriptures was sent forth into the world.[1] As to England in particular, I conclude these observations with an apposite quotation from an Anglican authority: "There has been much wild and foolish writing," says Blunt, "about the scarcity of the Bible in the ages preceding the Reformation. It has been taken for granted that the Holy Scripture was almost a sealed book to clergy and laity until it was printed in English by Tyndal and Coverdale, and that the only real source of knowledge respecting it before then was the translation made by Wickliffe. The facts are that the clergy and monks were daily reading large portions of the Bible, and had them stored up in their memory by constant recitation; that they made very free use of Holy Scripture in preaching, so that even a modern Bible reader is astonished at the number of quotations and references contained in medieval sermons; that countless copies of the Bible were written out by the surprising industry of cloistered scribes; that many glosses or commentaries were written, which are still to be seen, full of pious and wise thoughts; and that all laymen who could read, were, as a rule, provided with their Gospels, their Psalter, or other devotional portions of the Bible. Men did, in fact, take a vast amount

1 See Buckingham, p. 65; Cf. Panzer, *Annal, Typ. Brunet.*

of personal trouble with regard to the productions of the Holy Scriptures; and accomplished by head, hand and heart, what is now chiefly done by paid workmen and machinery. The clergy studied the word of God, and made it known to the laity; and those few among the laity, who could read, had abundant opportunity of reading the Bible, either in Latin or in English, up to the Reformation period. . . . Notwithstanding the immense destruction of manuscripts by the English Puritans, there still exist many vernacular Gospels, Psalters, and complete Bibles, of dates ranging from the ninth to the sixteenth centuries, relics that were witness to extensive labors, of which devouring time and fanatic ignorance have spared but a representative portion. The earliest of these translations known to us now is one of the Psalters by Adhelm, Bishop of Sherborne (A. D. 656-709). The Venerable Bede (672-735) made a translation, the extent of which is not recorded; but on the evening of his death he was engaged in finishing the Gospel of St. John by the aid of an amanuensis. King Alfred (A. D. 849-941) is said to have translated the whole Bible; and it is certain that he executed some portions of such a translation. In the British museum there is a magnificent English copy of the Gospels, called the 'Durham Book,' which is not more recent than the time of King Alfred; and there is another of the same age in the Bodleian Library at Oxford; a Psalter of the same period is in the Chapter Library at Salisbury (in Latin and Anglo-Saxon), and a book of the Gospels of rather a later date, in Corpus Christi Library, Cambridge; and doubtless many more known to those familiar with our manuscript treasures.[1]

Thus the Church of God, after having formed the Canon of Sacred Scripture, preserved it from the contamination and adulteration of spurious texts, defended it age after age against those who would tear it limb from limb, and morsel it and parcel it, and pervert its genuine meaning; thus has she during her long career been consistent in her deal-

[1] Rev. J. H. Blunt, "On the Reformation of the Church of England," vol. i, p. 505.

ing with it, treating it as the food of her children, and as the meat on which heroes and athletes are fed. Thus has she lavished the precious things of earth upon it, the pearl from the sea, the gem from the rock, and the gold and silver from the mine, to make it beautiful; whilst her children thought no privilege greater than that of being allowed to spend their lives in studying, transcribing and embellishing its Sacred Pages."

The Reader is here referred to the excellent work of S. R. Maitland, entitled "The Dark Ages," Scriptural Knowledge, p. 503-509, John Hodges, London, 1890.

Conclusion of Article III.

From all that has been said it clearly follows that the work of the innovators or reformers of the XVIth century is not the work of Jesus Christ. In Article V of the present chapter we shall further see that in the primacy granted by Jesus Christ to St. Peter and to his successors there is an unanswerable and easily understood proof of the illegitimacy of Protestantism.

Let us pray to God that our wandering brethren may, in the end, remember that *their ancestors were Catholic*, and that they may be convinced that in becoming Catholics themselves, they will not be changing religion. They will only be returning to the religion, which their fathers so unfortunately abandoned three centuries ago.

Inspiration and Tradition.

352. It will not be without benefit to indicate what the Church means by the Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures and by Tradition.

I. Inspiration. God by an efficacious influence, exterior or interior, inclines a man to write. He makes manifest to him, in a manner more or less detailed, the things which He wants written by the hand of this man; and whilst the writer labors at the execution of the divine work, the Holy Ghost assists and directs him, to the end that nothing in his writings should depart from the designs of Him whose instrument he is. For this man is really an

instrument in the hands of God, but he is a *living* instrument, endowed with intelligence and will; and God in employing him, does not take from him the exercise of this twofold faculty. That is to say, He allows the man to conceive in his own way the divine thought confided to him, and to choose the manner which suits him to express it. One thing alone is warranted by the divine Author, it is that *His thought* will be rendered faithfully by the Sacred writer. At times, it is true, God dictates the words themselves by which the divine thought is to be expressed; but generally the words and the arrangement of the details of the inspired writings are left to the choice of the man himself, under the direction and with the assistance of the Holy Ghost. Sometimes God manifests His thought to the writer without any effort on the part of the latter; at other times, He wishes that the writer, by previous or simultaneous labor of his own, should contribute to the conception of the divine idea. It is, therefore, in no wise unnatural, that the writer, in order to give an historical account, should call in the assistance of his memory, consult pre-existing documents, make researches, question witnesses of the events. Every statement thus written under divine inspiration, is the word of God and is infallible truth. It follows that the Bible, in its whole and in its parts, is invested with divine authority.

This remark enables us to understand the exact meaning of the words of the evangelist St. Luke (ch. i, v. 3): "It seemed good to me also, having diligently attained to all things from the beginning, to write to thee in order, most excellent Theophilus." In the same sense must be understood the concluding sentence of the author of the second book of Maccabees (ch. xv, 38, 39, 40): "I also will here make an end of my narration, which, if I have done well and as it becometh the history, it is what I desired; but if not so *perfectly*, it must be pardoned me." It is evident that this is not said with regard to the *truth* of the narration, but only with regard to the style and manner of writing, which in the sacred penman is not always the most accurate. (See II Corinth. xi, 16.)

References: 1. "Divina Inspiratio Sacrarum Scripturarum," by P. Zanecchia, O. P., F. Pustet, New York, 1898.
2. "General Introduction to the study of Holy Scriptures," by Rev. F. E. Gigot, S. S. Biblical Inspiration, p. 471.
3. "The Sacred Scriptures," by W. Humphrey, S. J. Benziger Brothers, New York.
4. "The Four Gospels," by Most Rev. M. Heiss, D. D., p. 214-231, Hoffman, Milwaukee.

II. TRADITION. In theological parlance, tradition is the attestation, otherwise than by the Sacred Scripture, of a fact, a dogma, or a custom. If this attestation, made at first by word of mouth, has been afterwards inserted in the writings of the Fathers or in historical documents, it is called *written* tradition; if not so included, it is *oral* tradition. If the authors of the tradition are the Apostles themselves, it is called *Apostolic* tradition.

The name of tradition is applied by theologians at times to the body of truths and precepts communicated at first by the Apostles by word of mouth; it is thus that we say: the deposit of Apostolic tradition; at other times it applies to *the fact itself of the uninterrupted transmission* of these truths or precepts; thus we say that such a dogma or such a precept of morality is proven by tradition; and finally, it applies in a *comprehensive* manner or sense, to these same truths and precepts as transmitted from age to age from the Apostles to ourselves. It is in this latter sense that we use it here.

Among the truths, which are attested by tradition alone, and which are not explicitly taught by the Holy Scriptures, we could cite, for instance, the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin, and the validity of baptism when conferred by heretics, with the matter and form required, the practice of infant baptism, and above all the authentic canon or catalogue of the inspired books of the Old and the New Testament, carefully separated from all spurious and apocryphal admixture, preserved in the Catholic Church and transmitted to us.

There are three principal organs of tradition, that is to say, three means by which we can ascend without risk of error to the Apostolic source: the universal and constant belief of the Church, sacred liturgy, ancient historical monuments, and in particular the writings of the Holy Fathers. (See Conf. of Father Olivier, 8th series.)

References: 1. Cardinal Franzelin's classical work on Holy Scripture and Tradition ("De Divina Scriptura et Tradione").

2. "The Faith of Catholics," vol. 1, "Apostolical Traditions," p. 387–450.

3. Fr. Humphrey's work, cited above.

ART. IV.— THE ORIENTAL SCHISMATIC CHURCH DOES NOT POSSESS THE MARKS OF THE TRUE CHURCH.

353. REMARKS. 1. We are not now concerned with the Nestorian, Jacobite or Eutychian heresies, which drag a lingering existence in the East and which existed long before the Eastern Schism. It is evident that the true Church of Jesus Christ cannot be found in these religious remnants, whose origin and authors can inspire no confidence; which have been formally condemned in the Ecumenical Councils of Ephesus (A. D. 431) and of Chalcedon (A. D. 451); which sects, far from having any unity between each other, are actually at war with each other; and which are, moreover, limited to some countries and have no force of expansion.

2. Care must be taken not to confound the Schismatic Greek Church with the *United* Greek Church. The latter, though having a particular liturgy and certain special disciplinary customs, forms a part of the Catholic Church. It embraces the Maronite Church, the Chaldean Church, and the Uniat or Melchite Greeks, all in communion with the Roman Pontiff. In all ages the Church has authorized usages peculiar to certain people in the celebration of Mass and the administration of the Sacraments, when these usages are not contrary to the dogmas of faith. Thus in the memorable act, in which it proclaimed the solemn reunion of the two Churches, the General Council of Florence decreed

"the immutable preservation of the customs of both Churches." Much more, acting in this according to the example of his predecessors, the Pope, Benedict XIV., severely prohibited the members from passing from one rite to another, and showed, in his Encyclical, that Rome has always endeavored to preserve intact the Oriental rite and always commanded its adherents to remain faithful to the liturgy of their Church.

This was also the line of conduct followed by Pius IX., and this is also, as everyone knows, the principle adopted by Leo XIII. We see thereby how vain is the fear on this subject that some ill-informed or ill-disposed writers seek to spread among schismatics, always extremely jealous of preserving their ancient usages.

354. HISTORICAL NOTICE. Under the generic name of the Greek Schismatic Church are understood the religious bodies emanating from the great schism of the East, begun in the IX. century by Photius, patriarch of Constantinople, but really consummated in the XI. century, by the ambition of Michael Cerularius, one of his successors, 1054.

Before Constantine had chosen Byzantium as his new capital, the episcopal see of that city depended upon the metropolitan of Heraclea. But no sooner had that city received from the great emperor the title of "The second Rome, eldest and beloved daughter of the old Rome," than ambition arose in the hearts of its bishops, proud of the favor which they enjoyed at Court and thwarting to their advantage the third Canon of the Council of Constantinople (381), which conferred upon the bishop of Byzantium "the primacy *of honor* second to that of the bishop of Rome," they did not wait long until they claimed to possess over the Eastern Church also the primacy of jurisdiction which had always belonged to the Roman Pontiffs.[1] Claiming that Constantinople should be as exalted in ecclesiastical as it was in political matters, John the Faster (583) was the first

[1] Neither this Canon nor the 22d Canon of the Council of Chalcedon ever received the approbation of the Sovereign Pontiff, though it was only a question of primacy of honor.

to assume the title of ecumenical or universal patriarch, and he maintained it in spite of the energetic protests and the prayers of Pelagius II. and St. Gregory the Great.

Already in the V. Century, the Pope, St. Leo, who had occasion to protest against the usurpation of the rights of the Church of Rome, had said with much truth: "the presence of the Emperor may make a royal residence, but he cannot create an *Apostolic See*, divine things not being patterned after human concerns."[1]

It is evident, that if changes had to be made in the hierarchal order of the Church every time that a political change were to occur in a country, we should be logically forced to say that Jesus Christ had founded His Church on shifting sand (Matth. vii, 24, 27), and not, as He proclaimed, upon a rock, against which the gates of hell shall not prevail. In such a condition of things, it would only require a handful of soldiers or the caprice of a sovereign, to sap the foundation and cause the ruin of the divine edifice.

Despite the ever increasing ambition of the bishops of Constantinople, the confirmation of every new Patriarch by the Pope continued, before and after Photius, to be considered, if not indispensable, at least of great importance for the newly elected bishop, to increase his prestige and as a proof of his orthodoxy. Thus Photius himself, though

[1] The principle held and proclaimed by St. Leo is so evident that the clergy of Constantinople itself still follows, even in our day, Catholic tradition on this point. In fact it is well known that the metropolitans of Chalcedon, Ephesus, Nicomedia, Heraclea and Cysicus are members of the Supreme Council of the Patriarchate of Constantinople, and that they enjoy on that account, many and important privileges. The reason is that those cities, now reduced to the condition of unimportant villages or hamlets, were in the past celebrated cities or chief centres of great provinces. If it were true that the vicissitudes of human politics bring about corresponding changes in the ecclesiastical hierarchy, these metropolitans should, long ago, have yielded their privileges to the bishops of Candia, Smyrna, Thessalonica, Rhodes, and many other cities. Moreover, if the Schismatic Greeks were consistent, if the motives put forth by John the Faster were founded on reason, the Bishop of Constantinople should have renounced the title of universal patriarch, because for centuries the Byzantine Empire has ceased to exist. Besides, this pompous title is all the more ridiculous in our day, from the fact that this patriarch has not now under his jurisdiction even one-sixth of the Christians of the Oriental schismatic rite!

he had usurped the see of Constantinople, did not fail to send to Rome an embassy to request his confirmation from Pope Nicholas I. The letter of the bishop-elect to the Sovereign Pontiff contained a profession of orthodox faith that gained for him the praise of the head of the Church. The confirmation was, however, refused, and in a Roman Council the usurper was excommunicated. It was only after reconciliation, followed by a second excommunication, fulminated by Pope John VIII., that Photius threw away the mask and cast off what he called the yoke of Rome. Then, to give to his rebellion a semblance of reason, he pretended that the Popes had become heretical, because, he asserted, they had tolerated the words *Filioque* in the Niceo-Constantinopolitan Creed. The protest was made over four hundred years after the addition of these words! And again, it was only much later, after the final separation, that the discusssion as to the *expediency* of the addition of the words *Filioque* degenerated into a dogmatic question concerning the procession of the Holy Ghost itself, the clergy of Constantinople claiming that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father alone.[1]

After Photius, the two Churches continued to be united, up to the time of Michael Cerularius, who renewed the claims previously put forth by Photius against the Roman Church, and who consummated the separation from the Church universal. Later a reconciliation was brought about and solemnly proclaimed at the Council of Florence, held in 1439, under the Pontificate of Eugenius IV.; but the ill-will of the clergy of Constantinople almost completely annulled the effect of this reunion.[2]

[1] It would be easy to prove that this procession of the Holy Ghost, as professed by the Catholic Church, had always been the subject of universal belief; it was, moreover, authentically acknowledged by the Greeks at the Ecumenical Council of Florence. If, in a Council held at Toledo, in 448, the word *Filioque* (*and from the Son* viz. proceeding from the Son as well as from the Father) has been added to the Formula of Nice, it was in order to put an end to the heresy of the Sabellians, who were denying that the Holy Ghost was personally distinct from the Father and the Son.

[2] Let us observe, that the right and duty of this reunion of the two Churches, thus decreed and proclaimed by an Ecumenical Council,

It is well that we should have correct ideas on the present situation of the separated Eastern Church. The following brief items will enable us to accomplish this purpose:

The Oriental Schismatic Church may be thus divided: First, into the Church of the Russian Empire; secondly, into that within the Turkish Empire, with Constantinople as capital; thirdly, into the Church of the Kingdom of Greece. The Church of the Russian Empire, at one time under the immediate control of the Archbishop of Moscow, and subsequently ruled by a patriarch, is now at the sole mercy of the so-called "*Holy* Synod of St. Petersburg," and though it would scorn to avow it, is, to all intents and purposes, a tool in the hands of the Czar, for without his sanction no change in the existing order of things can be made; not even can a Council be convoked without first humbly asking his permission.

The Church within the Turkish Empire is made up of the four Patriarchates of Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem. Constantinople, the headquarters of the Ottoman Empire, is also the chief patriarchal seat, and still rejoices in the proud title of New Rome. The Sultan is virtually the head of this church, and though they would fain deny it, its bishops and patriarchs are forced to confess that he is the supreme and final arbiter in every important dispute.

They thus met with a condign punishment for their rebellion against Rome. Instead of being the docile children of the Father of Christendom, they became the abject slaves of the successors of the impure Mahomet. Refusing to be ruled by the Tiara, they must submit to the Crescent.

The Church of the Kingdom of Greece, though nominally governed by the Synod of Athens, is as much a creature of the state as that of Constantinople or Russia, for it depends

---

recognized as legitimate by the Greek Church there largely represented, still rightfully exists unto our day. No later Council having abrogated or modified this solemn act, spontaneously signed by all, it still preserves its legal canonical force; consequently, in the eyes of every enlightened and sincere Greek, the Sovereign Pontiff, successor of Peter, ought to be acknowledged as the supreme and lawful Head of the Eastern as well as of the Western Church.

for its entire movement and being upon the will of the reigning monarch. It acknowledges no submission whatever to Constantinople, nor to any other branch of the Eastern Church.

Although these three great divisions of the Oriental Church include within their jurisdiction several churches which are both heretical and schismatical at the same time, still, as far as validity of Orders is concerned, the Holy See has expressed her doubt of none save of the Abyssinian.

The Greek schism has spread into Turkey, Greece, in a portion of Austria, and into Russia. The importance of the Russian nation requires that we should particularly explain how the schism was introduced into that country.

It would be a grave error to believe that Russia was won over to schism at the time of her conversion to Christianity. When, at the end of the X. century, this immense country received in a sure and definite manner the benefit of the *Catholic* faith, the Church of the East and the West *were living together in unity of faith and government.* Russia owed her conversion principally to the Princess Olga, regent of the kingdom from A. D. 945 to 955; but the movement towards Christianity became definite and complete only under the reign of her grandson, Vladimir the Great or the Apostolic. This zealous prince caused to be brought into the country *Greek priests* to teach to the Russian people the principles of the Christian religion. We can thence understand the great influence that, from the beginning, the Byzantine clergy enjoyed with the newly christianized nation, an influence which later on introduced the evil of schism into the midst of this powerful nation.

In reality the religion of the Russia of to-day is no more Greek than it is Prussian or Anglican. Though, at the time it embraced the schism, it had a metropolitan immediately dependent upon the Patriarch of Constantinople, it has long ago broken this bond, which attached it to the centre of the Great Schism of the East.

In 1589, the metropolitan of Moscow was raised to the dignity of Patriarch; but Peter the Great suppressed the

Patriarchate, and from that time the Russian Church is governed by the so-called *Holy Synod*, which exercises its functions in the name and by the authority of the Russian Czar, and is presided over by an officer of his court. Thus that country's Religion, separated not only from Rome and Constantinople, but from every patriarchate, intimately bound up with the autocratic government which rules all the Russias, is simply the *national* religion of Russia, and should be called Moscovitism.[1] There is nothing strange in the fact that in later times the Russian Church should have given to itself the name of *Orthodox* Church. Is there a schismatic or heretical sect that has not claimed to profess *the true doctrine?* We are, on the other hand, indeed pleased to acknowledge that the whole of the Greek Church, far different in this from the Protestant sects, has always preserved and still preserves unaltered almost all the dogmas of faith, as it received them at the time of the separation, which are in great part identical with those of Rome. This is most clearly shown by the very institutions of this Church, the writings of the Fathers most venerated by it, the prayers and hymns sung every day in the offices and ceremonies of worship, the religious practices and the traditions of the people.[2]

1 By the institution of the Holy Synod and the promulgation of the decrees concerning ecclesiastical government, Peter the Great destroyed even the appearance of independence in the Russian clergy. His successors aggravated the evil. The composition of this Synod depends exclusively upon the will of the Emperor, and all its acts are subject to the approbation of a minister of the Czar, bearing the title of Procurator of the Synod. In ecclesiastical seminaries and academies, the nomination and removal of professors, the choice of text books, the methods to be followed, everything depends upon the government. Accordingly it has happened that professional chairs have been held by Protestants and notorious unbelievers; the authors adopted as text books were for a long time and are perhaps to this very day Protestant writers. With such a system we can easily conceive what must soon become of the faith of clergy and people. There is nothing astonishing in the great progress made by Protestantism among the popes or priests of the Russian Church.

2 Protestants take great pleasure in calling attention, with quite an air of triumph, to the obstinacy, with which the Greeks persevere in schism and hatred against the Church of Rome. But do they not see that these very Schismatics are witnesses against them? In fact nearly all the dogmas, in which we believe, are almost exactly the same as those openly professed by the Greek Church. Evidently it is not since their Schism that these obstinate enemies of the Roman

§ I. The Greek Church Possesses Neither Unity of Belief nor Unity of Ministry.

355. "According to the teaching of St. Thomas Aquinas (2^a 2^{ae} q. xxxix, a 1) the name of Schismatics is given to those who refuse obedience and allegiance to the visible Head of the Church, the Supreme Pontiff, the Vicar of Christ and the successor of St. Peter. He also explains the difference between heresy and schism. Heresy is opposed to faith; schism to union and charity, so that although all heretics are schismatics, because loss of faith involves separation from the Church, yet all schismatics are not heretics, since a man may, from anger, pride, ambition, or the like, sever himself from the communion of the Church, and yet believe all that which the Church proposes for our belief. Still a state of pure schism—that is, of schism without heresy, cannot continue long—at least in the case of a large number of men. The words of St. Jerome (on Titus, cap. 3d) quoted by St. Thomas are to the point: "Schism at the beginning may be understood as something different from heresy; but there is no schism which does not invent some heresy for itself, in order to justify its secession." History abundantly confirms this observation. Bodies, which at first separate from the Church, merely because they think their personal rights have been infringed, are sure in the end, to deny the Church's unity and to lose the spirit of faith. And so, St. Thomas remarks that, as loss of charity is the way to loss of faith, so schism is the road to heresy." —*Catholic Dictionary*. Such has been the case both with the Oriental and with the Anglican schisms. Separation from Rome was soon followed by separation from the Faith of Christ.

A. That unity of belief be *possible* there is required an authority, a tribunal capable of pronouncing an infallible

Church have borrowed from her the dogmas which they now believe. Hence it must be admitted that such has always been the belief of the whole Church. Then what becomes of the reproach made by Protestants that the Catholic Church has in the course of centuries introduced new doctrines? And then why did Protestants not join the Eastern Church at the time of their rebellion against Rome?

decision on matters of Faith. Now, the Greek Church does not possess such a tribunal. Would any one say that the patriarch of Constantinople has this authority? In the first place, from what source would the patriarch derive his authority? Jesus Christ has given only one Head to His Church, and this Head, as we shall show (n. 359-366), was St. Peter, and after him the Bishops of Rome. What then could have deprived the successors of St. Peter of their divine authority, acknowledged by all during eight centuries, and have transferred it to the patriarch of Constantinople? Surely it was not the choice that Constantine made of Byzanthium as the Capital of his new empire. The authority which the Roman Church received directly from Jesus Christ belongs to her so exclusively that it can neither be modified nor changed by any Council.

Moreover, the third decree of the first Council of Constantinople (381), which raised the patriarch of that city above the patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem, gives to him, after all, only the *second* rank; he is placed after the Bishop of Rome. Now the Greek Church admits the authority of the seven first Ecumenical Councils. They are the following: First of Nice (A. D. 325). The first of Constantinople (A. D. 381). The Council of Ephesus (A. D. 431). The Council of Chalcedon (A. D. 451). The second of Constantinople (A. D. 553). The third of Constantinople (A. D. 680). The second of Nice (A. D. 787).

The Greek Schismatics admit *in principle* that, when there arises a doubt relating to faith, the patriarchs assembled in council have the right to pronounce doctrinal decisions; but as a matter of fact, no such assembly has ever been held since the time of Michael Cerularius, 848 years ago. In case of a doubt relating to dogma, the seven first general Councils are consulted. But who would venture to assert that *all the points* concerning dogmas and morals have been determined by these Councils of the first eight centuries and that there can be found in them the solution of all the controversies, that may arise until the end of time? Moreover, there is an evident contradiction in the Greek contention. If general Councils had the power necessary to finally de-

cide all controversies in matters of faith, by what right do they reject the authority of the Ecumenical Councils, which have been held subsequently to the *seven first Councils?* And finally, if it be true that the seven first Councils supply the answer to all controverted questions, let them cite the Ecumenical Council, which has decided that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father alone!

B. As to unity of government, it is far from existing in the Greek Church. The dependence of the Patriarchs of Jerusalem, Alexandria and Antioch on the Church of Constantinople is only nominal; that of the Russian Church absolutely null. On the one hand, subjection of the patriarchs and bishops to the head of the Turkish empire; on the other complete subordination and cringing servitude of the Russian Synod to the Czar—this is the deplorable state of the Eastern Church. Who can see in it the Church, one in Faith and free in action, which Jesus Christ founded on Peter, the one flock subject to the one and same shepherd? Is it to each of those two sovereigns that Jesus Christ has said: "Feed my sheep, feed my lambs?" In a word, the only bond which unites the various factions that compose the Schismatic Greek Church, and which permits the giving to them of a general name, is the common refusal of obedience to the successors of St. Peter in the See of Rome; it is their persistence in revolt against the religious authority established by Jesus Christ, acknowledged by the Greeks themselves until the IX. century, or more exactly, until the middle of the XI. century, and again admitted at the Council of Florence (A. D. 1438, 1439).

An Anglican minister, reported in the Paris *Univers* of February, 1852, speaking of the Oriental Schismatic Church, makes this statement regarding its belief: "The dogmatical errors professed in common by Schismatics, whether Phothians or Russian Orthodox, as they style themselves, are the following:

1. They deny the procession of the Holy Ghost, from both the Father and the Son, as from one indivisible principle, and they only admit His procession from the Fa-

ther. Hence their rejection of the clause *Filioque*—and from the Son—a dogma of the Catholic Church.

2. They reject the dogma regarding the primacy of jurisdiction of St. Peter and his successors.

3. The so-called Orthodox or Russian Schismatic Church denies the existence of Purgatory. This evidently appears from the following document. The Schismatic Russian Bishop Macarius, rector of the Ecclesiastical Academy of St. Petersburg, in a recent work (1860) entitled 'The Dogmatic Orthodox Theology,' vol. 2, p. 729, speaks thus: 'According to the belief of the Orthodox (Russian) Church there is not after death a place, or class of souls, intermediary between those that are saved and go to heaven, and those that are damned and go to hell.' Whether this was only his own individual opinion we are not prepared to state. Excepting these errors, which are, however, sufficient to destroy unity of faith, in all the other articles of Christian belief they perfectly agree with Catholics, and admit with us the same Creed." Behold here an additional argument in favor of the doctrines held by the Catholic Church, as well as an additional weapon against all the sects that attack them.

References: 1. "The Roman Church," by the Russian Jesuit, Ivan Gagarin.

2. Parsons, "Studies in Church History," vol. 2, p. 9–136.

3. Alzog, "Manual of Universal Church History," vol. 2, n. vi, "Eastern Schism," p. 448–468.

4. Guggenberger, S. J., "A General History of the Christian Era," in three volumes. B. Herder, St. Louis, Mo., 1900. Vol. 1, ch. vi, p. 287–294.

5. Darras, "General History of the Church," vol. 3, p. 73, n. 9.

6. Rohrbacher, "Histoire Universelle de l'Eglise Catholique," vol. vi, p. 446–618; vol. vii, p. 368–371, vol. x, p. 107–120.

§ II. The Schismatic Greek Church does not Possess the Mark of Sanctity.

356. Who would dare claim that the authors of the Greek schism have been distinguished by their holy life, and that their revolt against the See of Peter had virtue for its only motive, and not rather ambition or passions as their moving power? Most assuredly we freely admit that among the millions of schismatics, who have been born and brought up in complete good faith in the bosom of the Greek Church; who, like us Catholics, have the grace of the Sacraments, the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, the veneration of the Blessed Virgin, there are many souls pleasing to the Lord and worthy of His favor. But we ask, where are the Saints produced by this Church, since its separation from Rome, men of constant and heroic virtue, worthy of being compared with the Saints of the Roman Church? By what striking miracles, duly proven and completely authenticated according to historical criticism, has God manifested the heroic virtue of those personages, who, in Russia, are offered to the veneration of the popular masses? None whatever, as History proves. We abstain from speaking here of the moral debasement and the vices which are charged against a considerable portion of the Russian clergy. If this be the effect of human frailty in ministers of the altar, we would have the right at least to expect on the part of the ecclesiastical authorities serious and persistent efforts to raise them out of this state of degradation and ignorance, and to make them less unworthy of the people's respect.

References: 1. See references cited in preceding number (355).

2. "Eutropia, or how to find the Way into Life and Certainty," ch. 36. Burns & Oates, London, 1880.

§ III. The Schismatic Church does not Possess the Mark of Catholicity.

357. Since it has ceased through its revolt to form part of the Roman Catholic Church, the Schismatic Church is

confined to the limits of a few countries in the East and to Russia. As to the *Russian* Church in particular, its very name clearly proves to us that it does not belong to Jesus Christ, for the Saviour has not founded *National* Churches; He wished, on the contrary, that there should be only one fold, under the staff of the one and sole shepherd. If the Russians claim that their Church forms part of the Greek Church, it is against all evidence, as no hierarchical bond unites the two Churches, the Russian and the Greek. We are not ignorant of the fact that at the *present time* there are *epistolary* relations between the Synod of St. Petersburg and the Schismatic Greek patriarchs; but no one can see in what way these recent relations modify essentially the present situation, and in what respect especially can they change the situation during past centuries.

The Schismatic Church, notwithstanding the vast extent of the empire, which protects it, does not possess Catholicity of numbers. According to recent statistics, the schismatic Slavs number something over eighty millions. But, as we have shown, religious unity is far from reigning among these populations, which are united principally by the spirit of nationality, pushed to its extreme limits. In spite of the iron hand of despotism, which endeavors to prevent new schisms from introducing themselves into the old, we see swarming within it sects of every kind, known under the name of Raskolniks, the principal one of which is that of the Starovéres or Old Believers. It is by the millions that we can count the dissenters, who have severed all union with the Holy Synod, as the latter had done with the patriarch of Constantinople, and he in turn with Rome. What would be its lot, if the temporal power, which sustains more or less efficiently this religious body, should happen to abandon it to its own destiny?

Let us add that the spirit of *Proselytism* born of the command of the divine Master: "Go and teach all nations," does not exist in the Greek Church. Each year, it is true, the procurator of the Synod submits to the Emperor and publishes a report, in which he devotes a special part to the

work of propagation of the state religion. We do not deny that the number of recruits increases as the frontiers of the empire are extended; but this is evidently by no means the effect of the apostolic zeal of its missionaries nor of the blood of its martyrs. Russia is yet at the first page of its martyrdom, but on the other hand it can count by thousands the unfortunate Catholics of Poland, whom it endeavors to rob of their Faith by brutal violence and persistent persecution.

§ IV. The Schismatic Church does not Possess the Mark of Apostolicity.

358. In the first place it is not bound to the Apostles by doctrine, for its doctrine has varied. During the nine or rather ten and eleven first centuries of the Catholic Church, the East as well as the West believed in the primacy of the Pope of Rome and in the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father and the Son, as we ourselves believe to this day. We will find most numerous and convincing proofs of this in the work of Pitzipios *l'Eglise Orientale* (the Eastern Church) and in the *Bibliotheca Græca orthodoxa* (The Greek Orthodox Library) of Assemani. Now the Greek Church, as we have proved (n. 355), no longer admits these two dogmas; it has therefore varied in its belief. It teaches that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father alone, and that He rests in the Son; it makes the personal distinction between the Son and the Holy Ghost consist in the *manner* of receiving divine existence, the one by generation, the other by procession, denying at the same time that this difference comes from the relation or origin.[1]

It has not preserved the apostolicity of ministry any better, as its revolt against the authority, to which it had been so

[1] We shall not speak of other points of divergence, purgatory, for instance. In reality the difference between the two churches, the Catholic and the Greek Schismatic Church of the East, consists in the *word* employed to designate this place of expiation. The Schismatics reject absolutely that of purgatory, but they admit the reality of temporal expiation as well as the efficacy of prayer for the dead. This clearly appears from their liturgy, their canticles, the usages and the institutions of that Church. As to the Russian Schismatic Church, see what we stated above (n. 355) relative to this article of Catholic faith.

long respectfully submissive, broke the chain, which attached it to the Apostles by the lawful transmission of pastoral jurisdiction.

In closing what we had to say about the Greek Schism, we cannot but notice with pleasure the movement towards a return to Catholic unity, which is now beginning to show itself in the Russian Church. This movement is such that the historian Pogodine and many other Russian writers admit, perhaps with some exaggeration that, if religious liberty were granted to the Russians, half the orthodox peasantry would at once pass over to the dissenting sects, to the Raskol, already a most powerful body in spite of persecution; but they add that half of the members belonging to the higher society would become Catholic. It is known that not long ago, a learned Russian, not a Catholic, Mr. Soloview, the son of the celebrated historian of that name, addressed a series of nine questions to an archpriest and through him to all the prelates of the Eastern Church not united to Rome. These questions, which show the preoccupation and doubt, that disturb a number of distinguished men, concerning the pretended orthodoxy of the Schismatic Church, seem to indicate a serious inclination towards a return to Catholic unity. The readers can find in a small volume by the same Mr. Soloview, *L'Idee Russe* (The Russian Idea), the very significant judgment, concerning his own church, pronounced by I. S. Aksakow, a declared enemy of the Roman Church. These are the terms in which the latter concludes his examination of the Russian Church, after having justified his opinion by a long series of undeniable facts. "The spirit of truth, the spirit of charity, the spirit of life, the spirit of liberty, these are the things which are wanting in the Russian Church." *Ocuvres Completes d'Ivan Aksakow* (Complete works of Ivan Aksakow), vol. IV.

Let us multiply our prayers that the Russian people, so remarkable for its vigor, its religious spirit and its patriotism may learn at last where it can find salvation, from the social as well as from the religious point of view. Let them

be convinced that no sacrifice of their national love and patriotism is asked of them; that the Pope thinks now less than ever, of imposing upon them the rites and disciplinary customs of the Latin Church. For the only thing the Russian Church is expected to do in order to effect a sincere union with Rome is to renew the broken chain of its ancient traditions, to return to the doctrine which was taught to it by the first Apostles of the Slavs, St. Cyril and St. Methodius created Bishops by Pope Adrian II.; to return to the doctrine of the most illustrious holy doctors of the East, Athanasius, the two Gregories, Chrysostom, Theodore Studitus, the two Cyrils, Ignatius of Constantinople, all inviolably united to the Roman See.

Let us close this article by repeating these consoling words of Leo XIII. in his admirable Encyclical *Letter to the princes and peoples of the whole world (Praeclara gratulationis)* of June 20, 1894: "We cannot forego the cheering hope that the time is not far distant, when the Churches of the East, so illustrious by the faith of their ancestors and their ancient glory, will return to their point of departure." "There is nothing," he further says to the Orientals, "which is of a nature to make you fear, as a consequence of this return (to Catholic unity), any curtailments of the rights, of the privileges of your patriarchates, of the rites and customs of your respective churches. For it has always been and ever shall be the intention of the Apostolic See, as it has been one of its most constant traditions, to deal with every people with a great spirit of condescension, and to exhibit the greatest regard to their ancient usages and traditions.

ART. V.—THE PRIMACY OF THE SEE OF PETER, OR THE PAPACY.

359. This question should naturally find its place in the following chapter, in which we treat of the prerogatives of the Church and of her Supreme Head. We take it up here, because the primacy of the Roman Pontiff offers a new mark of truth, *sufficient in itself*, to distinguish the true

Church of Jesus Christ from *all heretical and schismatic sects.*

Above all, it is necessary to distinguish three kinds or degrees of primacy, that of jurisdiction, that of honor, and the primacy of simple directive authority.

Primacy of honor is a mere right to precedence; it does not confer the power to govern, not even to direct. The power of directive authority is the right to regulate the discussion of affairs, like that possessed by chairmen in deliberative assemblies. Quite different is the primacy of jurisdiction; it is a true right *to govern*, which includes a threefold power, legislative, judicial and executive.

Jesus Christ conferred upon St. Peter the full right to govern, or the primacy of jurisdiction; it is this primacy which is denied by Protestants and Greek Schismatics.

Let us then prove: I. That Jesus Christ conferred upon St. Peter the primacy of jurisdiction over the universal Church. II. That He intended that this primacy should be transmitted to his successors. III. That the Church of Rome, and she alone, possesses the primacy of the See of Peter.

FIRST THESIS.—JESUS CHRIST CONFERRED UPON ST. PETER THE PRIMACY OF JURISDICTION OVER THE WHOLE CHURCH.

360. FIRST ARGUMENT, taken from the words of Jesus Christ. Among the words of Jesus Christ addressed to St. Peter, there are some which contain *the promise* to give him the primacy of jurisdiction, and there are others that contain the performance or practical fulfillment or execution of this promise.

a. THE PROMISE. Jesus having asked of all the disciples, who were about Him, what they thought of His person, Peter alone, in his own name, openly proclaimed the divinity of the Savior: "Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God." Pleased at this profession of faith, Jesus at once made answer to him who had pronounced it: "Blessed art thou, Simon Bar—Jona, because flesh and blood hath not revealed it to thee, but my Father, Who is in Heaven. And

I say to thee: That thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it, and I will give thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven." *Et ego dico tibi quia tu es Petrus, et super hanc petram ædificabo ecclesiam meam, et portæ inferi non prævalebunt adversus eam. Et tibi dabo claves regni cælorum.* (Matt. xvi 16, 17, 18, 19).

It is very evident that here it is to Peter and not to the whole Apostolic body that Jesus addresses Himself. Incarnate wisdom could not indeed express itself in ambiguous terms, when it was question of a promise of such importance. The Master spoke to make Himself understood, and He desired that there should be no misunderstanding of his words. That Protestants should endeavor to explain these words in quite a different manner from us, no one need wonder; for to accept the natural and obvious sense of the text would be fatal to their claims. It would be a suicidal act.[1]

The paramount importance of this question *requires* that we should enter into a few developments. Let us at first observe that it is to the same Peter that these two words refer: "Thou art Peter" and "upon this rock." In the Latin language the masculine word Peter—Petrus is changed into the feminine word Petra—a rock, and in English the masculine term Peter is changed into the neuter word rock; but it is not the same in the Syro-Chaldaic language, which the Savior used, and in most of the Eastern versions; for in these languages it is absolutely the same word which is repeated: "Thou art a *rock* and upon this *rock*." Moreover, the demon-

[1] It is well to remark that in this text, whose meaning is so clear, Protestants, by following their system of private interpretation, have succeeded in discovering at least ten meanings not only different from but opposed to and destructive of each other. Thus, some hold that our Lord addressed Himself, not to Peter but to the entire Apostolic body. Others claim that in saying: "Upon this rock" He meant *His own person*. In truth, this would be a very singular, a very unexpected recompense granted to the faith of Peter, and announced in such solemn terms. Then why should the Savior have spoken in the future tense: "I will build?" And who does not see, moreover, that the words "I will build" and "I will give," are closely bound together as well by their meaning as by the particle "and," and that if one of these two verbs designates Peter, the other must likewise designate him?

strative pronoun "*this*," upon *this* rock, which is found in all the texts, clearly shows that the question concerns Peter. As to the pronoun "*it*," which closes the text, whether it means the rock or the Church, the general sense does not change; for, if according to the promise of Jesus Christ, the power of the devil will never be able to prevail against the Church, it is because the Church is built upon Peter. This rock is established as the foundation of the spiritual edifice.

Let us now show that it is really *the fullness of power* that the Savior promises to Peter. In fact, the foundation upon which a perfect society rests, cannot be anything else than the supreme authority which governs it. As it is to the character of its foundation that a building owes its solidity, the close union of its parts, and even its very existence, it is likewise from the authority of Peter that the Church derives her unity, her stability, and even her existence itself. The Church, therefore, cannot exist without Peter.

As St. Ambrose (A. D. 397) said, echoing the tradition of the Christian centuries that preceded him, "*Ubi Petrus, ibi Ecclesia*:" Where Peter is, there is the Church. As if he said, "where the living trunk is, there is the tree," where the center is, there is the circle; where is the foundation, there is also the edifice; where the throne stands, there exists the empire; and where the Church is, there is Christ, her Founder; and where Christ is, there is salvation; for as St. Peter himself spoke (Acts iv, 12) "Nor is there salvation in any other. For there is no other name under heaven given to men, whereby we must be saved."

But to secure the result desired by the Savior, this authority must be full and entire; it must comprise the threefold power, legislative, judicial and coercive or executive; in other words, Peter shall be invested with the primacy, not only of honor, but moreover and especially with the primacy of jurisdiction. His authority will extend over the whole Church, over the Apostles as well as over the Faithful. It is not a portion only of his Church that Jesus gives him to govern, that of Rome, for instance, that of Antioch, it is *His* Church, it is the religious society, which He has founded.

The following words, registered immediately after the text of St. Matthew quoted above, and which were also addressed to Peter alone, are no less conclusive in support of his primacy: "And I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth, it shall be bound also in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, it shall be loosed also in heaven." (Matt. xvi, 19.) Everyone knows that in the language of the Sacred Scripture as in other languages, and especially in the Eastern expression, the deliverance of the keys of the kingdom means granting supreme power, complete sovereignty. Jesus desires that this power be exercised over all the members of His Church without exception, over the leaders, bishops and priests, as well as over the Faithful; for it is really the Church that in this passage, as in many others, is designated under the name of the kingdom of heaven.

361. Objection. To escape the cogency of the peremptory argument in favor of the primacy of Peter, drawn from the text of St. Matt., it might be said, that the power to bind and loose, here promised to Peter alone, was granted later on to all the Apostles.

We might thence conclude, it would seem, that the promise made to Peter, in the present instance, had not as its object a more extended power than that which was to be granted later on to the other Apostles.

To prove that this conclusion is wrong, it suffices to observe that Jesus Christ, in addressing Peter alone and in such a solemn manner, does not promise him only the power to bind and loosen, but He further and at the very outset promises to make him, Peter, *the foundation* of His Church and to give to him *the keys* of the kingdom of heaven. Evidently this promise, made as a reward for his profession of faith, and in such expressive terms, cannot be without meaning. It must therefore contain something more than the simple promise of the power to bind and to loosen; it evidently implies the *primacy* or highest privilege in the exercise of this power.

All can bind and loosen, but not all *in the same manner*.

Peter, who first and alone received this promise, will receive this power *in its fullness* and without any restriction or limitation; he will exercise it even over the other Apostles; they will receive it, also, but after Peter, secondarily and not over him. Moreover, it is the *traditional teaching*, which Bossuet in his celebrated discourse on the Unity of the Church sets forth when he says: "It was evidently the intention of Jesus Christ to confide at first to one person alone the power which later on He wished to entrust to many: but the subsequent act of the divine Savior and Master does not reverse the previous one and the first does not lose its place. The promises of Jesus Christ as well as His gifts are without repentance, and therefore not subject to revocation, and that which is once given indefinitely and universally is irrevocable; moreover, the power given to many persons suffers restriction by being divided, whilst power given to one person alone over all and without any exception implies plenitude of power."

If there remain any reasonable doubt as to the meaning of the words of Jesus Christ He Himself removes it at the moment that He fulfills His promise.

b. Fulfillment of the Promise. After His resurrection, Jesus Christ appears to several of His Apostles on the borders of the Lake of Tiberias. Thrice he asks of the Apostle, who has thrice denied Him, of Peter alone, the question: "Simon, son of John, lovest thou me more than these?" Peter answers these questions with a triple and touching protestations of love. Then Jesus addresses him in these solemn and decisive words: "Feed my lambs, feed my sheep." (John xxi, 16-17.) It is known that in the Greek text the word "feed" means to rule, to govern. Here then we have Peter, and Peter alone, appointed shepherd of the fold of Jesus Christ, and the authority which he receives is in nowise limited. And yet more; at the very time that Jesus designates the whole church under the figure of a *flock*, He explicitly distinguishes in this flocks the *lambs* from the *sheep*, indicating under the first name the members of the flock, and under the second those who engender them

unto spiritual life and who are the guide and appointed to feed them, that is, the bishops and priests. As He places Peter at the head of all the flock, Jesus Christ confers upon him by this act the most extended powers, the primacy of jurisdiction. "Every one," says Bossuet, "is subjected to the keys given to Peter, all, kings and people, shepherd and flock. It is to Peter that the injunction is made firstly to love more than all the other Apostles, and then to feed and rule all, the lambs and the sheep, the young as well as their mothers, and the shepherds themselves; shepherds with respect to the people, sheep with respect to Peter."

362. SECOND ARGUMENT. Derived from the facts related in Scripture. In the Gospels and in the Acts, Peter always appears as the first and the leader of the other Apostles without there ever arising thereby any protest from any of the others. Thus St. Matthew, in enumerating the Apostles, is not satisfied with naming Peter in the first place, though he was not the first called to the Apostleship, but he expressly says that Peter *is the first*: "Now the names of the twelve Apostles are these: The first Simon, who was called Peter." (Matt. x, 2.) After the Ascension of the Savior, it is Peter whom we see calling, presiding over and directing the assembly, at which St. Matthias is elected; it is he that first preaches the Gospel to the Jews, it is he that receives the order to baptize Cornelius and open the Church to the Gentiles; it is he that punishes Ananias and Saphira for the falsehood they uttered and confounds Simon the Magician; it is he that affirms before the tribunal his right and his mission to preach, and who performs the first miracle in confirmation of the new religion; first also, he speaks to the Council at Jerusalem; and all the assembly "having heard these things, held their peace" (Acts xi, 18); cast into prison, he absorbs the attention of all the Church, and "prayer was made without ceasing by the Church to God for him," (Acts xii, 5), until his miraculous delivery; it is he who founds the See of Antioch, which for that reason became a patriarchal See; finally it is he who founds the See

of Rome, and it is *because he died bishop of that city* that his legitimate successors have always had and always will have the primacy in the universal Church.

363. THIRD ARGUMENT, drawn from Tradition. The Holy Fathers agree in interpreting the above texts, in the sense of a true primacy of jurisdiction given to Peter. The limits of this book do not permit us to develop this important proof. We cannot, however, dispense ourselves from setting forth a few texts, borrowed principally from the first centuries, during which, according to Protestants themselves, the Church of Jesus Christ preserved the pure doctrine of Christ. These texts are so clear and explicit as to render comment unnecessary. Hear Tertullian: "Nothing could be hidden from Peter, called the rock, as it was upon him as upon a foundation stone that the Church was built; from Peter I say, who received the keys of the kingdom of heaven, with power to bind and to loosen on earth and in heaven." In another place he says that "The Lord gave the keys to Peter, and by Peter to the Church." (Pres. No. 22, Scorp.)

Origen declares that "though the Church is built upon all the Apostles, Peter nevertheless is her principal foundation and the very solid rock upon which Christ has built her." "Peter received the Supreme power to feed the sheep." (Hom. 5 on the book of Exodus; Hom. on the letter to the Rom.) "Though our Lord," adds the same writer "gave to all the Apostles the power to bind and to loosen, yet, in order that unity should come from the authority of one person alone, He spoke to Peter and to him alone, when He said: "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it."

We could supply the testimony of Eusebius of Cæsarea, St. Hilary of Poitiers, St. Gregory Nazianzen, St. Ephrem, St. Epiphanius, St. Basil, St. Ambrose, St. John Chrysostom, St. Jerome, St. Augustine, St. Eucher, bishop of Lyons, and many other Fathers and writters of the IV. and V. centuries; but we must quote the following explicit text of St. Leo the Great: "Peter alone was chosen to be placed at the head of all the Apostles and all the Fathers of the

Church. Though there are many priests among the people of God, yet Peter rules them all as Christ governs them in the first place. It is a great and wonderful part of His divine power that God in his exceeding goodness gives to this man; if God wished to impart some of it to the other leaders in the Church, it was always through Peter that they received what God did not refuse them." (Serm. III). See conf. of Father Olivier, S. J., 7th series.

SECOND THESIS.—JESUS INTENDED THAT THE PRIMACY SHOULD BE TRANSMITTED TO THE SUCCESSORS OF PETER.

364. This thesis has already been proven when we treated of the Apostolicity of the ministry (n. 325). Let us, however, set forth a few decisive reasons, which specially concern the primacy of the See of Rome.

The form of government, or the organization given to the Church by Jesus Christ, can be modified only by Himself. But Jesus Christ, in founding the Church, has established a primacy; no person has the right to tamper with it, much less to suppress it. It must therefore always subsist, not in St. Peter alone, who was to die, but in all his lawful successors.

Moreover, the text of St. Matthew puts forth the primacy of St. Peter as the foundation of the Church, without which she cannot subsist. For it is this primacy that is to maintain in the Church unity of government, purity of doctrine, sanctity of morals; it is, in a word, upon it that the stability and efficacy of the divine work depend. The foundation of an edifice, and especially of an edifice of this nature, must necessarily *last* as long as the edifice itself, that is to say, according to the divine promise until the end of time. But Jesus knew full well that Peter was not to live always. He, therefore, evidently intended that his ministry, his primacy should be perpetuated until the consummation of ages in his legitimate successors.[1]

[1] To prove the primacy of St. Peter and that of his successors, the Roman Pontiffs, we might appeal to all ecclesiastical history. It would then be seen, that from the beginning of the Church and in

REMARK. It results from the two preceding theses that the jurisdiction or power of the Popes is *general* and not restricted to determined cases. Jesus Christ did not impose any restriction, when He made Peter the foundation of his Church and the shepherd of his flock. He wished that this Church should always find her stability in her foundation, and that the flock should always obey its shepherd. Undoubtedly, in the interest of good government itself, the Popes generally exert their jurisdiction only to direct and to oversee, leaving to the bishops that initiative and liberty of action which assure to subordinate administrations all their efficacy in the details of government. Hence, the rights conferred upon them by the Supreme Pastor of Souls (Jesus Christ) are preserved unimpaired.

The whole doctrine on the primacy of jurisdiction granted by Christ to St. Peter and his legitimate successors, is ably summed up by Dr. Ludwig Pastor in his first volume of the "History of the Popes from the Close of the Middle Ages," p. 179-181.

"It was the will of Christ that the whole Church should have a single, visible Head, so that, by the mutual connection of all the members among themselves, and by the subjection of all these members under one head, the most perfect unity should subsist. Therefore, a short time before His Ascension, our Savior, according to his promise (St.

---

all the centuries since then, the most positive facts and the most certain testimonies attest the belief of pastors and flock in the primacy of the See of Rome. We do not think it necessary to enlarge upon these historical facts, which are, moreover, to be found in a multitude of books. Let us cite in particular the 69th Conference of Father Olivier. "We should never end," says he, "if we were to cite all the appeals to Rome from the East as well as from the West, either to implore the support of the Pope in the struggle against error, or to obtain from him the re-establishment on their Sees of bishops unjustly deposed, or finally to consult him upon doubtful questions concerning faith or discipline. . . What would suffice to prove the primacy of the Popes is the fact that never, in the East or in the West, was any council whatsoever, even among the greatest, ever recognized as ecumenical, that is, representing the universal Church, unless it had been convoked at least implicitly by the Pope, and also presided either by himself or by his legates or confirmed by him. . . As the concurrence of the Popes was considered essential by the whole Church, the whole Church acknowledged, by that very fact, the papal primacy of power and jurisdiction"

Matt. xvi, 17-19), appointed the Apostle Peter, after his threefold profession of love, to be His Vicar on earth, the foundation and centre of the Church, the shepherd of 'the lambs and the sheep,' that is to say, of the whole multitude of the redeemed on earth, as related by St. John (xxi., 15 et seq.).

The primacy conferred on St. Peter, according to the teaching of the Church, is not merely a primacy of precedence and honour, but one of supreme jurisdiction, of complete spiritual power and authority. Inasmuch as Christ committed this power immediately and directly to St. Peter, he holds it for the Church, but not *from* her; he is not her representative and delegate, but her divinely appointed Head.

Neither the Primacy nor the Church is a transitory institution. St. Peter was Bishop of Rome, there he died a martyr's death under Nero. It is an article of the Catholic Faith, that all his prerogatives and powers are by Divine appointment transmitted to his lawful successors in the See of Rome. This plenitude of power was from the first contained in the Papacy, but was, of course, manifested only in such measure as the needs of the Church and the circumstances of the time required.

The Bishops of Rome, as direct successors of the Prince of the Apostles, according to Catholic teaching, possess by Divine appointment, the plenitude of episcopal power over the Universal Church. Supreme, full, and lawful spiritual authority over all the Faithful is theirs. In virtue of this supreme authority, all her members, including Bishops, are subject to the Pope; subject, whether we view them as isolated individuals, or as assembled in Council. Far from subjecting the Pope to a Council, the early Church held it as a principle that the supreme authority could be judged by no one. A General Council cannot exist without the Pope or in opposition to him, for, as Head of the Church, he is the necessary and essential head of the General Council, whose decrees receive their ecumenical validity solely from his confirmation. As supreme legislator, the Pope

can, in matters of discipline, revise and change the decrees of a General Council, as well as those of his predecessors. Former ecclesiastical legislation forms a precedent for his action, in so far as he, being the superior, is by his own example to show respect to the law. The power of the Primacy also contains, comprehended within itself, the supreme judicial power. Appeal may accordingly be made to him in all ecclesiastical matters; there is no appeal from his judgment to another tribunal; the plenitude of power over the Universal Church, conferred on the Holy See, is limited by nothing but Divine and natural law."

THIRD THESIS.—IT IS THE CHURCH OF ROME THAT POSSESSES THE PRIMACY OF THE SEE OF PETER.

FIRST ARGUMENT. The Bishop of Rome is the successor of St. Peter.

365. It would seem that no question or reasonable doubt could possibly arise as to this fact. It is clearly evident that the Catholic Church, and she alone, obeys the successors of St. Peter, the first overruling Pastor given to the Church by Jesus Christ Himself. Tradition and history offer us, concerning the coming of Peter to Rome, a mass of evidence so overwhelming and so clear, that for twelve centuries no one ever dreamt of raising any doubt concerning his residence in Rome.

After the Waldenses, who were, it seems, the first to controvert this historical fact, Protestants would naturally follow their example and call it in question, as it was of great importance to them in their controversies with Catholics, being really a matter of life or death with the reformers. In consequence they have done everything to disprove it, and after them the modern unbelievers have spared no labor to overthrow this truth, so well proven by the documents and made still more certain by the literary labors which these attacks have brought forth. It would be well, we think, to notice briefly some of the arguments supplied by the most authentic documents.

The Episcopate of St. Peter at Rome is a most important

event from both the theological and the apologetical point of view. For, though the fact itself strictly belongs to the domain of history, yet it is, at the same time, intimately connected with the dogma of the primacy of the Roman Pontiffs. If, by divine right and by the express will of Jesus Christ, the sovereign Pontiff succeeds to St. Peter, and possesses the primacy over the whole Church, what has attributed to the Bishops of Rome the right of being the legitimate successors of St. Peter, is, according to Catholic tradition, an historical fact, viz: the sojourn, the episcopate, and the death of the Prince of the Apostle in Rome. This remark suffices to make us comprehend the gravity of the question in which we are presently engaged. If St. Peter had no definite Episcopal See at Rome, it is all over with the fundamental reason invoked by the whole Christian tradition to prove that the Roman Pontiffs are the lawful successors and inheritors of the Prince of the Apostles. This explains the reason of the bitter and persistent opposition of Protestantism to this undeniable fact.

I. The Prince of the Apostles himself can serve as a witness. In his first epistle(ch.v, 13), addressed to the Christians of Asia Minor, he says in closing: "The Church which is in Babylon, . . . saluteth you and *so doth* my son, Mark." This name of Babylon evidently means here, as well as in various places in the Apocalypse, the City of Rome, looked upon at that time by the Jews as the centre of impiety, as old Babylon of the East had been by the Jews of the captivity. It is in this sense that the Fathers of the Church have always understood it. Renan himself is fully of their opinion, as well as the Protestants Grotius, Cave, Lardner, etc. Moreover, the arguments used by learned unbelievers to combat this ancient tradition, and to prove the Babylon of St. Peter's epistle to be a city of the East, do not bear serious examination.

We cite in proof of our statement some passages from two recent Standard Protestant Commentaries on the New Testament.—1st. The Speaker's Commentary, edited by the Archbishop of York, in its note on the first letter of St. Peter, chap.

v., verse 13, says: "All ancient authorities are unanimous in the assertion that the later years of Peter's life were passed in the West of the Roman Empire. Here we have to encounter the *uniform, unvaryiug testimony of early Christian writers.* From whatever quarter their voices reach us, they affirm that the Babylon mentioned by St. Peter is here a recognized appellation of Rome. In fact, no other view of the passage was entertained or suggested before Calvin. The presence and martyrdom of St. Peter in Rome are mentioned by [the non-Catholic writers] Credner, Bleek, Wieseler, Meyer, Hilgenfeld, Mangold, Thiersch, Ewald, and nearly all unbiased critics." Calvin himself (Inst., book IV, ch. vi, § 15) later on wrote as follows: "I no longer question the fact of the martyrdom of St. Peter in Rome, which is unanimously attested by all historians."

2nd. The Bible Commentary, edited by Dr. Ellicott, Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol, speaks thus: "The whole subject, has, of late years, been sifted to the bottom by various German and other writers. . . . Though every conceivable difference may be found between these authors respecting the dates and duration of St. Peter's sojourn in Rome, very few are so hardily skeptical as to reject altogether evidence as strong, early and wide as that on which we believe that Hannibal invaded Italy." See "Cathedra Petri," by C. F. B. Allnatt.

II. At the end of the first century, St. Clement, Bishop of Rome (A. D. 90), and a disciple of St. Peter himself, speaking of the Faithful put to death by Nero after the burning of Rome, names among the number St. Peter and St. Paul, and he adds these significant words: "They were a great example among us; it is here that they bore the outrages of men and suffered all kinds of torture." It is known that the epistle of St. Clement to the Corinthians is the earliest Christian writing, next to the inspired Scriptures, that has come down to us.

Forty years after the death of St. Peter, Ignatius, brought from Antioch to Rome, to be made the prey of wild beasts in the amphitheatre, addresses to the Romans this touching

prayer: "I beg of you, do not show me kindness out of season; let me become the food of wild beasts. . . . I do not command you as St. Peter and St. Paul; they were Apostles, I am only a condemned prisoner." These words have no meaning unless it be admitted that the two Apostles governed the Roman Church.

In this connection it is edifying to recall the remarkable words uttered by this indomitable Martyr before being devoured by the wild beasts in the Roman Amphitheater—"Frumentum Christi sum, dentibus leonum molar, ut panis dignus efficiar"—"I am the wheat of Christ; I shall be ground by the lion's teeth that I may become good bread."

If in the first days of Christianity we find few explicit testimonies of the sojourn of St. Peter in Rome, there is nothing in it to surprise us. Besides, but few writings of that epoch have come down to us, and no one at that time dreamed of doubting such a notorious fact, neither did they think it necessary to attest it; it is not during times of persecution that writers concern themselves about plain and undeniable facts. Hence, it is only incidentally that they happen to mention the residence of Peter in the eternal city.

III. A century after the death of St. Peter, the tradition of the sojourn and martyrdom of the Prince of the Apostles at Rome was universal. Renan himself acknowledges it. "Everybody," says he, "admits that at the close of the second century, the general belief of Christian Churches was that St. Peter suffered martyrdom at Rome." This is what is said by Tertullian, who lived at Rome at the end of the second century. "Glance over the Apostolic Churches, you will find the very Sees which the Apostles occupied, each in its place. If you are near Italy, you have Rome. Oh! fortunate Church, to whom the Apostles gave their doctrine and their blood, where Peter suffered the death of the Master." "If you go to the Vatican or on the Ostian Way (via Ostia)," wrote Caius, under the pontificate of Zephirin (A. D. 202-219), "you will find the tombs of those who founded this Church." In another place, he says that Eleutherius (A. D. 182) "was the thirteenth bishop of Rome since St.

Peter." St. Ireneus, bishop of Lyons and disciple of St. Polycarp, who received the teachings of St. John, mentions twice, in his treatise against the heretics, that Peter and Paul founded the Roman Church. The same language is held by St. Denis of Corinth (A. D. 162), Clement of Alexandria (A. D. 217), Origen (A. D. 254). St. Cyprian, martyred in the year 258, gives the name of Chair of Peter to the Roman Church.

It is useless to cite the Fathers of later times; they are unanimous in their assertion.

366. The testimony of the Fathers of the Church, whose unanimity cannot be accounted for otherwise than by the Apostolic tradition, faithfully preserved through the flight of time, is further strengthened by the authority of the General or Ecumenical Councils which are the authentic voice of the Universal Church. We shall only quote the four first Councils, which have always been regarded by both the Eastern and Western Church with special veneration, and considered to be almost equal to the four Gospels.

The Council of Nice (Nicea—now called Isnich, in Asia Minor, about 90 miles from Constantinople), held A.D. 325, attests, in plain terms that the Church of *Rome always had the Primacy*. It was so true that here it was question of primacy of jurisdiction, that the Council of Sardica, an appendix or continuation of that of Nice, acknowledges that a bishop deposed by the episcopal Council of a province has the right to appeal to the Pope. For the texts of the Councils, see the great work of the Jesuit writer, Philip Labbe, in 18 folio volumes. (See "Nomenclator Literarius," by H. Hurter, S. J., vol. 2, p. 180–189).

The second General Council, held at Constantinople in 381, also places the Bishop of Rome before the Bishop of Constantinople, the imperial city. In 431, the bishops assembled for the third time in Ecumenical Council, declared at Ephesus that if they depose the heresiarch Nestorius, it is because they are thereto obliged by the holy canons and by the letters of the Most Holy Father Celestine, Bishop of the Church of Rome. Then, in 451, the Council of Chalce-

don, whose testimony is too long to cite, is still more explicit. We shall only say that on the letter of St. Leo to Flavian, Bishop of Constantinople, being read, all the bishops exclaimed: "*This is the belief of our Fathers, this is the belief of the Apostles. It is thus that we believe; it is thus that all orthodox Christians believe. Anathema to him who will not so believe! It is Peter who has spoken to us through Leo.*" And then, the confirmation of the acts of the Council is asked for from the Pope "*in order that he may supply by his authority that which may be wanting to the authority of his children.*"

It is unnecessary to speak of Councils which followed, whose doctrine on the point at issue is undoubted. Let us recall, however, that of Florence, held in 1439, in which the *Greeks* as well as the Latins subscribed to the following decree of Pope Eugenius IV: "We define that the Holy Apostolic See, viz; the Roman Pontiff, has the primacy of jurisdiction over the whole world; that this same Roman Pontiff is the successor of the blessed Peter, Prince of the Apostles; that he is the Vicar of Jesus Christ and the Head of the whole Church, the father and doctor of all Christians; and that he has received from Our Lord, in the person of the blessed Peter, full power to feed, rule and govern the Universal Church, *as it is declared in the acts of the Ecumenical Councils and the Holy Canons.*" The last words of the decree are those of the Latin text, which is clearer than the Greek text; it must not be forgotten that the Latin is the original text, first subscribed to by the Fathers of the Council.

Let us in the last place hear the words of the Vatican Council, in chapter III of the *Constit. Dogm. of the Church.* After renewing and developing the definition of the Council of Florence, it adds: "If any one say that the Roman Pontiff has only a power or supervision or direction, and not the full and supreme power of jurisdiction over the whole Church, not only as to what concerns Faith and morals, but also as to what refers to the discipline and government of the Church spread throughout the whole world; or else that he has only a principal part of that power and not its entire plenitude;

or finally that the power, which he possesses, is not ordinary and immediate either over all the Churches and each of them, or over all the pastors and faithful and each of them, let him be anathema."

IV. The most ancient catalogues which enumerate the succession of the Roman Pontiffs, all agree in placing St. Peter at the head of the list. Such are the catalogues of St. Ireneus, Tertullian, and Optatus of Mileve. Eusebius, who borrows his list from the Memoirs of Hegesippus (A. D. 175–187), writes in his history: "The first after Peter, Linus, became Bishop of the Roman Church; Clement was the third."

V. The same attestation comes from the ancient monuments, the medals and the paintings of the first centuries. According to de Rossi, it is veritably the episcopal chair of St. Peter, the seat which he used in sacred ceremonies, that is venerated at Rome as a precious relic. The author of the poem against Marcion, at the beginning of the third century speaks of "the very chair where Peter was seated and upon which he had commanded that Linus should be the first to occupy that seat after himself." Tertullian expresses himself in the same manner concerning the episcopal throne of Peter.

VI. Against the constant tradition of the first centuries no contrary tradition can be brought forward; no city, with the exception of Antioch, ever prided itself with having had at any time St. Peter as first pastor; nowhere, except at Rome, men ever thought of showing the tomb of the Prince of the Apostles. Though the Ebionite and Gnostic Apocryphal books have related a thousand fables about St. Peter, no one ever ventured to place the See of his episcopate outside of Rome.

Lastly, among so many heretics and schismatics of all times, no one until the appearance of the Waldenses, or rather, it may be said, until the time of the reformers in the XVI. century, expressed any doubt as to the general belief in this historical fact, the sojourn and martyrdom of St. Peter in Rome. Let us add, that among Protestants there are many, and these among the most learned, who admit with us the so-

journ of St. Peter in the eternal city. We shall mention in particular Cave, Grotius, Usserus, Basnage, Scaliger, Neander.

Let us add that the coming and death of St. Peter in Rome, which were formerly looked upon as legends and fables by the majority of rationalists, are today almost universally admitted as real events, so that many Protestants themselves, such as Zahn, Lightfoot, and the learned Anglican bishop of Durham, have largely contributed by their investigations to the triumph of truth. After the admission of such facts on the part of the enemies of the Papacy themselves, it matters little, if the sojourn of the Prince of the Apostles in the eternal city is not considered as long as it was formerly believed. In recent times it was the school of Baur, a Tübingen Professor, that tried to destroy this immemorial and very general tradition, but with no success. In the words of the German Professor Harnack, no friend to the Papacy (Chron. p. 244): "It was first Protestant bias, then biased critical prejudice, that denied St. Peter's martyrdom at Rome. That it was a mistake is to-day apparent to every student, who is not blinded. The whole critical apparatus, by means of which Baur contested the old tradition, is today justly considered worthless."

The following items from the "St. Louis Review" for Feb. 20, 1902, are most suitable to our purpose: "There militates against this theory another mass of evidence—proof that cannot be obliterated, viz; the records in brass and stone that have been and are daily brought to light in the Eternal City. Father H. Grisar, S. J., has collected them in his "Geschichte Roms und der Papste," (History of Rome and the Popes), Freiburg, Herder; 1901. Vol. 1, pp. 219–239, of this splendid work contains an exhaustive treatise on the sepulchre of St. Peter. Whatever has been brought to light by the numerous excavations bears testimony to the fact that St. Peter was buried in Rome. The same Father Grisar (p. 225), quoting Lanciani, says: 'For the archaeologist, the presence and execution of St. Peter and Paul in Rome are facts established beyond the shadow of a doubt by purely monumental evidence.' "

On seeing the forcible testimony on behalf of this historical truth, a testimony dug out of the very bowels of the earth, we are reminded of those words of our Bl. Redeemer in St. Luke's Gospel (ch. xix, v. 46): "And Jesus said to them: I tell you that if these should hold their peace, the stones will cry out."

Lastly, Father Kneller, S. J., in a recent pamphlet establishes this thesis; "Aside from the facts related in Holy Scripture, there is none in the history of the early Church so well authenticated as St. Peter's stay and martyrdom at Rome" (p. 5). And he confirms his thesis by quoting more than two dozen prominent non-Catholic authors of different nationalities, who uphold Peter's presence at Rome.

Hence, it is incontestable that Peter, put to a martyr's death in the year 69, came to Rome and died there the bishop of that city.

We can even fix the year 42 as the year of the arrival of the Apostle in the city of the Cæsars. This is attested by the author of the first part of *the Catalogue of Tiberius*, the historian Paulus Orosius, a writer of the IV. century, the historian Eusebius, whose Chronicle was written about the year 310, and St. Jerome, likewise of the IV. century (A. D. 370-420).

This is the unequivocal testimony of this distinguished Doctor in his book (De Viris Illustr., c. 1). "Simon Peter, Prince of the Apostles, after his Episcopacy over the Church of Antioch, and after preaching. . . . . in Pontus, Galatia, Coppadocia, Asia, and Bythinia, goes to Rome in the 2nd year of Claudius to defeat Simon, the Magician, and *there he held the Episcopal chair twenty-five years* down to the last year of Nero, . . . under whom he also suffered martyrdom, being crucified with his head downward. . . He was buried at Rome on the Vatican Hill, near the Triumphal Way, and is honored with the veneration of the whole city."

According to the illustrious archeologist de Rossi, ancient monuments fully confirm this date.

It is, moreover, to be particularly remarked that there is no ancient author or any monument which contradicts, either

directly or indirectly, the twenty-five years of the episcopate of St Peter; and the learned Bollandist Ch. De Smedt, in his "*Dissertationes*," does not hesitate to conclude that the opinion attributing to St. Peter twenty-five years of episcopate at Rome "is by far the most probable."

It must not, however, be thought that during all this period St. Peter lived in Rome uninterruptedly, viz; *without ever going away from it.* The contrary is altogether probable. Indeed, there is in Lactantius (A. D. 325), in particular and the catalogue of Felix IV. (A. D. 526), distinct mention of a second voyage to Rome by St. Peter under the Emperor Nero.

The series of the succession from St. Peter to Leo XIII. is known to us. Therefore it is Rome, and consequently the Roman Catholic Church, that possesses the See of Peter. No sect, indeed, has ever claimed that honor.

It follows logically from this single fact that the Roman Catholic Church is the true Church, for she alone possesses *the center and the foundation*; *she alone preserves the original* organization in all her integrity.

As the author of that excellent little manual, "Catholic Belief," wisely remarks: "In the face of millions of Catholics recognizing, generation after generation, the Bishops of Rome as the successors of St. Peter in that See; in the face of the most ancient and most illustrious of all dynasties the regular line of 257 Roman Pontiffs (A. D. 1902), who have at all times claimed to succeed to the chair of Peter; and in the face of a large number of historians (many of them non-Catholic, and even hostile to the Roman Church), who have borne witness to the same fact, without a single ancient writer asserting the contrary" how utterly insignificant, not to say ridiculous, appear the puny efforts of some Protestant writers, who attempt to question the fact that St. Peter was ever in Rome. As it has happened in other instances that the bitter attacks of our adversaries only served to bring out the Catholic truth in greater relief, so it is in this case. The denial by modern Protestants that St. Peter was ever in Rome only gave an opportunity both to Catholics and to fair

minded non-Catholic historians to bring forth a host of historical documents in proof of this part of general belief.

Some such documents and authorities are here given in the following references:

1. "St. Peter and the First Years of Christianity," by the Abbé Constant Fouard; New York, Longmans, Green & Co., 1893; Appendix IV, "St. Peter at Rome," p. 398-411.

2. "Was St. Peter Bishop of Rome?" "Historical Evidence for St. Peter's Roman Episcopacy," by C. F. B. Allnatt; Catholic Truth Society, London, 1889.

3. "The Primacy of the Apostolic See Vindicated," by Francis Patrick Kenrick, Archbishop of Baltimore; John Murphy & Co., 1857; ch. vii, "Peter Bishop of Rome."

4. "Catholic Controversy," a reply to Dr. Littledale's "Plain Reasons," by H. S. D. Ryder of the London Oratory. Christian Press Association Co., New York, 1898; p. 48.

5. "Catholic Belief," by Very Rev. Joseph Faá di Bruno; Benziger Brothers, New York. "St. Peter in Rome," p. 314-328.

6. "Dictionnaire Apologetique de la Foi Catholic" (Apologetic Dictionary of the Catholic Faith), by Jaugey Delhomme et Briguet, Paris, 1889; vol. 2, p 2393-2456. The most able and exhaustive treatment of the subject to be met with in the writings of modern times.

7. "Catholic Dictionary," by W. E. Addis and T. Arnold, M. A.; Catholic Publication Society, New York, 1894; p. 671 et seq.

8. "Ecclesiastical Dictionary," by Rev. J. Thein; Benziger Brothers, New York, 1900; p. 551-552.

9. "De Romano Pontifice," Palmieri, S. J. "On the Primacy of St. Peter," p. 296-428.

10. "The Review," edited by Arthur Preuss, St. Louis, Mo.; "Was St. Peter in Rome?" February 20, 1902.

11. Cardinal Bellarmin, S. J., in his standard work in four folio volumes entitled, "De Controversüs Christianae Fidei" (Controversies on Christian Faith); Book 2nd from p. 298- 311.

12. "Evidence for the Papacy," by Lindsay.

This indefatigable writer, to prove the Supremacy of St. Peter and his legitimate successors, quotes an overwhelming array of testimonies from the words of the Fathers of the first five centuries of Christianity, the period during which the Church, as Protestants themselves hold, had maintained in its purity and integrity the doctrine of Jesus Christ. His 140 quotations are directed to demonstrate the following points:

1. The primacy of both honor and jurisdiction granted by Christ to Peter.

2. Peter is the Rock, on which Christ built His Church.

3. Peter is the solid, unshaken foundation sustaining the whole edifice of Christ's Church.

4. Peter divinely constituted and held by the Faithful the Vicar, Vicegerent or Representative of Christ.

5. The Church, who is said to have been founded on the Apostles (Eph. ii, 20), is also founded on St. Peter singly and alone.

6. Universal Extent of the Divine Commission given by Christ to Peter.

7. St. Peter the Supreme Head and Ruler.

(See Advent Conferences, by Archbishop B. Vaughan. Appendix, p. 98-104).

CHAPTER III.

Of Some Prerogatives Conferred by Jesus Christ Upon His Church.

367. That the Church might be enabled efficaciously to pursue her mission of saving souls until the end of time, her wise and all-powerful Founder was bound to endow her with certain privileges or prerogatives indispensable for such a purpose. We shall especially treat of the gifts of indefectibility, authority and infallibility bestowed by Christ upon His Church.

ART I.—THE INDEFECTIBILITY OF THE CHURCH.

IDEA OR DEFINITION OF INDEFECTIBILITY. Considered in the fullest extent of its meaning the indefectibility of the Church is a property, which consists in the permanence which Jesus Christ assured to her until the end of the world, with the maintenance of her interior constitution and exterior form, and the preservation of all her prerogatives. The Church may, indeed, permit during the course of centuries *disciplinary* changes required according to circumstances, for the welfare of souls, but she will never be deprived of any of her constituent elements (her members, her chiefs, her organization), nor of any of her essential properties (Unity, Sanctity, Catholicity, and Apostolicity, etc.), nor of her divine prerogatives, such as Authority, Infallibility, etc.

Let us remark, however, that this promise of indefectibility has been made to the Church *Universal* and not any of her parts or particular Churches. These may decay or disappear: but despite their shipwreck the true Church of

Christ will ever remain indefectible, and ever Catholic also; the losses suffered will be duly compensated by new conquest and the foundation of new Churches. (See n. 332.)

THESIS.—JESUS CHRIST IN FOUNDING HIS CHURCH INTENDED THAT SHE SHOULD LAST, WITHOUT ANY ESSENTIAL CHANGE, UNTIL THE END OF TIME.

368. FIRST ARGUMENT. A great number of texts of the *Old Testament* clearly foretell this perpetuity of the reign of Jesus Christ. We here confine ourselves to citing these words of Daniel (II. 44): "The God of Heaven will set up a Kingdom, that shall never be destroyed, and His Kingdom shall not be delivered up to another people; and it shall break in pieces and shall consume all these kingdoms; and itself shall stand forever." In place of the synagogue, which was to change form and be essentially perfected, we find the Kingdom of the Messiah, the new alliance, the Christian Church destined to live forever and remain always the same. This is the argument, to which St. Paul frequently recurs, in particular in his epistle to the Hebrews.

369. SECOND ARGUMENT. *The New Testament* is no less explicit. Sole mediator between God and man until the end of time, Jesus Christ confided to His Church the means of salvation, the fruit of His Redemption. Now this is what, with His supreme authority, He declared to Peter in making him the supreme Head of the Church: "And I say to thee, that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." (Matt. xvi, 18.)

This was indeed to declare the indefectibility of His Church. Moreover, the mission confided to the Church is to save souls and until the consummation of ages, the time appointed by the Lord, there will always be souls to lead to heaven. Hence, the Savior, in commanding His Apostles to go over the whole earth teaching and baptizing, promised that He would be with them until the end of time. (Matt. xxviii, 20.)

370. THIRD ARGUMENT, taken from theological reason. If the Church could fail at any time, she would lose, by that

fact alone and forever, all effective authority. Would not then every rebel have the right to boast that the Church had failed in her mission, that she was corrupt, and that therefore she no longer deserved belief or obedience? And is not this the very pretext set up by the innovators of the XVI. century in their attempt to justify their revolt?

We deem it advisable to supplement the preceding statements on the indefectibility of the Roman Catholic Church by the following concluding remarks. The hopes of mankind rest on the sublime mission she has received from her divine Founder. Sprung from on high, the connecting link between earth and heaven, between time and eternity, the sole inheritor of undying promises, she never ceases to assert the great law, which lies at the root of all true civilization—the supremacy of mind over matter, of the spiritual over the temporal, in a word, of truth over error, for truth alone can stand out to its possessors with the fixed stability of a mountain range, whose broad basis rests upon the solid earth, and whose summit pierces the lofty firmament above. Such is the Catholic Church; like an immovable rock in the midst of the stormy deep, she survives every tempest, and braves every conflict. Truly, it is the Church's lot to be buffeted by the world; it is her glorious destiny to suffer with her Master; she would not be the spouse of the thorn-crowned King, were she not to drink liberally of his chalice, and one of the most striking marks of her divine origin would have been wanting in her, were she sustained by the sunshine and flattery of the world. She is the only institution that has preserved her life, her vigor and her autonomy unimpaired for the last 1800 years. Kingdoms, empires, republics are swept away by the irresistible current of time, and yet Catholicity remains, a standing monument of enduring firmness, whose equal the world has never seen. Here, indeed, the principle of the so-called Darwinian theory of evolution is found for once to be true, for we have in the history of the Catholic Church the struggle for existence and the survival of the fittest. Of the old guard of the first Napoleon it was said that they *died*, but never surrendered. Of the

Catholic Church we can truly say that she neither *dies*, nor *surrenders*. When the tyrant is gone to the dust, and the proud voices, that predicted her downfall, are hushed and forgotten, she lives to teach and save the nations—she lives, and shall live, leaning on the almighty power of Him that built her. She shall persevere in her stability through the ages till eternity shall strike the passing knell of all human things, for she is the house built by the wise man, nay by Incarnate Wisdom itself "upon a rock. And the rain fell, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and they beat upon that house, and it fell not, for it was founded upon a rock." (Matth. vii, 24-25).

ART. II.—AUTHORITY OR POWERS OF THE CHURCH OF CHRIST.

371. Founded in order to continue until the end of the world the work of redemption, the Church should consequently have received the authority necessary for the perfect fulfillment of her mission. According to the teaching of theology, a threefold power was granted to her for that purpose; the first concerns faith; the second regards the administration of the sacraments and worship; and the third has reference to the government, properly so-called, of Christian society. Though, when speaking of unity of doctrine and unity of government in the Church, and in proving the primacy of St. Peter, we have already demonstrated the existence of the three powers, it will not be without profit to briefly group together the principles relating to these subjects.

"Christ then gave to His Church the triple office of teacher, priest, and pastor, comprised in the twofold power of orders and jurisdiction.

By power we here understand not only a passive right, but also an authority, which men are bound to respect and obey. Thus the Apostles received the authority as well as the right to preach the Gospel without let or hindrance; and, consequently, those, to whom they preached, were bound to accept their teaching.

The charge intrusted by Christ to His Church comprises the threefold office and threefold power of *teacher*, *priest*, and

pastor, also reckoned under the titles of Prophet or Preacher, Priest and King. In virtue of the first the Church communicates the truths of revelation; in virtue of the second she administers the means of grace; in virtue of the third she efficaciously directs the Faithful to their last end.

Christ conferred on His Apostles the *priestly office* when He said to them at the last supper: "Do this for a commemoration of Me" (Luke xxii, 19). The words, "As the Father hath sent Me, I also send you. . . . Receive ye the Holy Ghost. Whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven them; and whose sins you shall retain, they are retained" (John xx, 21-23), refer likewise to the priestly office. The *pastoral office* in its most comprehensive sense was contained in the words addressed to St. Peter: "Feed My lambs; feed My sheep" (John xxi; cf. Matt. xvi, 19). Christ, moreover, gives His Apostles the charge "to preach the Gospel to every creature;" whence the obligation for all to accept it: "He that believeth not, shall be condemned" (Mark xvi, 15, 16). In this charge is, therefore, contained the *teaching office*, i. e., the right to teach with authority.

The power thus indicated in the gospel *was exercised* by the Church from the earliest times. The Apostles discharged the *teaching office* by preaching the Gospel, and demanding its atteptance in the name of God. They exercised the *priestly office* as often as they acted as "the dispensers of the mysteries of God" (I Cor. iv, 1), ordaining priests and bishops (Acts xiv, 22), celebrating the sacred functions of the Church (I Cor. x, 16-29). They exercised the *pastoral office* as often as they issued laws or precepts (Acts xv, 29), or excluded criminals from the Church's communion (I Cor. v, 5; I Tim. i, 20). Doubtless the Apostles, who with the assistance of Christ and the light of the Holy Ghost propagated the Church, must have known the extent of the authority committed to them. We must, therefore, conclude that the authority exercised by them as rulers of the Church was actually given them by Christ, to be transmitted to their successors to the end of time." (See Handbook of the Christian Religion, by Rev. W. Wilmers, S. J., p. 77-78.)

REMARK. In treating of the apostolicity of the Church (n. 358), we have spoken only of two powers with which the Heads of the Church are invested; the power of order and the power of jurisdiction. We were then considering these powers from the point of view of the *source* from which they emanated. Here we speak of the three special powers treating of them from the particular point of view of their special object or purpose.

I. Power to Teach.

372. The Church has received from her divine Founder the power to teach or doctrinal authority, that is the right and the duty to preach the dogmatic and moral doctrine of Jesus Christ and to impose upon all men the obligation to accept this doctrine. That this is so is an undeniable fact. We shall content ourselves with indicating or rather simply recalling a few arguments.

373. FIRST ARGUMENT. As the doctrine of Jesus Christ can only be known through the ministry of *teaching*, the Church, in receiving the mission to make that *doctrine* known everywhere, *must also have received the power* to teach all men.

As the Apostle St. Paul writes (Rom. x, 13, 14, 15, 17) "For whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord, shall be saved. How then shall they call on Him, in whom they have not believed? Or, how shall they believe Him of whom they have not heard? And how shall they hear without a preacher? And how can they preach unless they be sent? (See n. 381) . . . Faith then cometh by hearing and hearing by the word of Christ."

374. SECOND ARGUMENT. These words of Jesus Christ are well known: "All power is given to me in heaven and in earth; going, therefore, teach ye all nations" (Matt. xxviii, 18-19). "He that heareth you, heareth me; and he that despiseth you, despiseth me, and he that despiseth me, despiseth Him that sent me" (Luke x. 16).

375. THIRD ARGUMENT. Firmly relying upon these words of their Master, the Apostles, immediately after the de-

scent of the Holy Ghost, gave themselves up to the ministry of preaching. "But they going forth preached everywhere, the Lord co-operating with them and confirming the word with signs that followed" (Mark. xvi, 20). To those who wished to forbid their preaching, they opposed the celebrated words which have become the watchword of every true Christian when confronted by tyrannical power: "We ought to obey God, rather than man;" and again: "For we cannot but speak the things which we have seen and heard" (Acts v, 29; iv, 20).

376. Remarks. 1. The method of teaching used by the Church is twofold. *Ordinary* teaching is that which is given everyday, by the Bishops, or by their delegates and under their supervision, the Priests, by preaching, Catechism, courses in theology, etc. *Extraordinary* teaching is that given by the Pope or Councils, when they proclaim a dogma or condemn an error. Extraordinary teaching is not at all necessary in order that a dogma should become obligatory as a matter of faith. If that were required, the dogma of the Holy Eucharist, for instance, would not have been obligatory before the tenth century, and, in our own days, the dogma of the visibility of the Church, that of her indefectibility, etc., would be left open to belief or denial, because they have never been solemnly defined. The Church can no more err in her ordinary, universal and constant teaching than in her dogmatic definitions; the promises made by Jesus Christ suffer no exception. To be a heretic therefore, it is enough to knowingly deny a doctrine set forth by the ordinary and uniform teaching of the whole Church. (P. Olivier, 84th Confr.)

2. From this mission and from this power ensues the duty for the Church to maintain the purity of the Faith, to warn the Faithful against erroneous, impious or immoral doctrines; to forbid the reading of books and newspapers, which might corrupt faith or morals. Hence also, the obligation to supervise every *dogmatic and moral* teaching given in society by all classes of teachers, either private or official, that is appointed by the State. No one will contest this, if the question concerns *Christian Society*. But even, if the constitution

be based upon the freedom of worship, the State, if it truly respects liberty, cannot refuse to the Church this supervision, which forms an integral part of the Catholic apostolate. The State should, moreover, at least for those who profess Catholicism, come to an understanding with the ecclesiastical authorities, in order that they may exercise an efficacious control over the teaching of *human knowledge*, generally devolving upon the laity. Because, *if this be not done*, the liberty and authority of the Church would become illusory, as official professors and teachers might with perfect impunity on questions of the sciences, of history, literature, etc., contradict, attack and neutralize the lessons of the Church, her dogma and her morality. Finally, with far greater reason, the Church has a right to severely condemn anti-religious, atheistic or so-called *neutral* teaching, even when organized under the patronage of the State. In such a case the Church, to preserve her children from error and deception, must use all the resources, all the spiritual weapons of which she can dispose.

These reflections suffice to explain and to justify the stand *taken by* the Church toward civil governments, when they pass laws sanctioning teachings opposed to some revealed doctrines, of which she has been appointed guardian, interpreter and preserver.

II. Power of Dispensing the Sacraments.

377. The second power, which the Church received from Jesus Christ, is that of determining everything that relates to the administration of the Sacraments, the celebration of the Holy Sacrifice, and, in general, public worship.

First Argument. How could the Church fulfill her mission of saving souls, if, whilst she enlightened the mind with the light of revelation, she could not confer the spiritual *strength* indispensable to enable the Faithful to observe the precepts enjoined by divine revelation? Now, it is principally by the Sacraments, the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, and the practice of religious worship, that the Faithful obtain the graces necessary to nourish spiritual life. The Church,

therefore, should possess these means of grace in order to fulfill her mission, the sanctification of souls.

SECOND ARGUMENT. Moreover, the *will of the Savior* is quite explicit in this regard. Thus at the time He gave to His Apostles the command to teach, He imposed upon them the obligation to baptize all men; on another occasion He granted them the power to forgive sin; at the last supper, after having distributed to them His flesh and His blood, He commanded them to do the same thing in commemoration of Him.

THIRD ARGUMENT. The Apostles themselves bore witness to the existence of this power in the Church by the fact that they exercised it, and explicitly by their own words. Hence we see them baptize, confirm, ordain, celebrate the Holy Sacrifice, administer to the sick, etc.; and St. Paul writes: "Let a man so look upon us as the ministers of Christ, and the dispensers of the mysteries of God" (I Corinth. iv, 1).

III. Power to Govern.

378. The right conferred upon the Church to govern herself includes three other rights, analogous to those possessed by civil society; *legislative* power, or the right to make laws obligatory upon all the subjects of the Church; the *judicial* power, or the authority to interpret her laws; and finally, *executive or coercive* power, that is, the right to enforce, by all necessary means, especially by the use of penalties spiritual or temporal, the observance of the laws, which she imposes upon her members. The enemies of the Church in our day do not deny to her the right to teach and to administer the Sacraments; after all, they do not trouble themselves much about these matters. But they make every effort to destroy *in her*, if they could, the power of self government; they know that to deprive her of this power, or simply to restrict its exercise, would be to disturb, in a serious manner, the order and well-being of the Church, to leave her without the power of repressing revolt among her members and of repelling the violent open attacks or the secret machinations of her enemies.

If we were to believe them, the Church has no right to enact laws, to judge crime, to punish the guilty; or, if she has any right at all in this respect, it is not a right properly belonging to her, nor anything inherent to her constitution, but it is a right received by participation or communication from *the civil power*, by the benevolent concession of civil rulers, or simply an abuse arising from the neglect, the tergiversations, or the connivance of political governments.

We shall at once give some of the proofs, which establish this important power enjoyed by the Church of Jesus Christ.

FIRST ARGUMENT. *A society* cannot exist and attain its end without the power of governing itself. A multitude of persons desirous of attaining a certain end necessarily requires a common and effective direction. Hence, from the moment that it pleased the God-man to unite in a perfect society all who believed in Him, He was bound to provide that society with the authority necessary for the accomplishment of its mission. In other words, He was bound to appoint leaders invested with the triple power, legislative, judicial and executive; for a society always implies law, and law implies the right to judge its guilty transgressor and the right to impose penalties proportionate to the crime.

SECOND ARGUMENT. This is deduced from the words already cited from *Scripture* and in particular from those that were specially addressed to Peter. (See n. 359–364).

THIRD ARGUMENT. Taken from the *conduct of the Apostles* and from the history of the Church in the earliest ages of her existence. From the very beginning the Apostles used all the powers entrusted to them, such as making laws, pronouncing judgments, and smiting with anathema the guilty, and all this was done without consulting the civil power, and even in spite of its opposition. (See Acts xv, 28; I Tim. i. 20; I Cor. xi, 33-34; vii, 12-13; v, 3, 4, 5; iv, 21; xi, 2; I Thess. iv, 2). In the following centuries, the Church continued to act as her first rulers had done, by virtue of the authority, which belonged to her as of right, and the belief in the governing authority of the lawful Heads of the Church

never varied among the loyal members. (See 61st conf. of Father Olivier.)

ART. III.—INFALLIBILITY OF THE CHURCH.

I. Its Nature and Necessity.

379. NATURE OF INFALLIBILITY. To be infallible is, in general, to have the privilege of not falling into error or of not leading others into error in teaching; for the Church it means the privilege of being preserved from all danger of changing the doctrine of Jesus Christ, or of mistaking the true meaning of what the divine Saviour has taught, commanded or forbidden. Undoubtedly, God alone is infallible *by nature;* but He can, by a particular act of His providence, ensure against errors those, whom He appoints to teach in His name, so that in their teaching they may never swerve in any way from the truth. What He could do, we shall prove that He has done in reality. We shall even go further; we shall show at the very outset that this privilege *should have been granted to the Church.* In making this statement we have in view *the present ordinary course* of things, for in another order of providence God *might have* used other means; for instance, He might have sent prophets, as He did under the Old Law.

FIRST THESIS.—THE AUTHORITY ESTABLISHED TO TEACH TO MEN THE DOCTRINE OF JESUS CHRIST MUST BE INFALLIBLE IN ITS TEACHING.

380. FIRST ARGUMENT. Taken from the mission of Christ, and the necessity of divine Faith. It may be set forth in different ways.

a. Jesus Christ has given to His Church the mission and the power to teach His doctrine and to transmit it from age to age *pure and intact.* Unless He were to intervene by continued miracles to preserve the purity of His teaching, Jesus Christ necessarily had to place the Church as a teaching body beyond all danger of error, in other words, endow her with doctrinal infallibility.

b. The Church imposes upon every man, in the name of

God, a rigorous obligation to believe, with a faith excluding all doubt, that which she proposes for his belief, even mysteries most impenetrable to reason. But the Church cannot have the right to impose upon the conscience of men the obligation to believe, with a firm and immovable faith, that which she teaches, if she herself is subject to error in her teaching. Without the infallibility of the Church divine faith would be impossible, and with the disappearance of faith, the Christian religion itself, and all means of salvation, would disappear, for, as St. Paul says (Hebr. xi, 6), "Without faith it is impossible to please God."

c. Let us state this argument in a still more general manner. When there is question of religious truth necessary to salvation, the reason of every man imperiously demands a teaching which is *absolutely certain*. It is not only the unlearned that feel the need of such a teaching; long research and study, and sincere effort do not exempt learned men from experiencing the same need. Hence, if there were not an infallible teacher of religion, mankind would see itself abandoned to all the chances and dangers of error; it would drift about uncertain as to that which most essentially concerns the peace and happiness of men, religious and moral truth. (Eph. iv, 14.)

d. The same conclusion follows if we apply this reasoning to the preaching of the Gospel *amongst heathen and unbelieving nations*. Without infallibility, the spread of the Gospel throughout the whole world would have been impossible, and consequently Catholicity could not have been a distinctive mark of the true Church of Christ. The Church sends missionaries everywhere, with the mission to convert the people to the true Faith. But if these authorized missionaries do not teach in the name of an infallible authority, these people would have a right to say that perhaps the doctrine preached to them has been changed in passing down to them through the centuries. Who could reasonably oblige them to place firm and full belief in a doctrine, which may after all have been erroneous? What difference would there be between such preaching and the preaching of Protestant

ministers, who disclaim infallibility and cannot consequently require faith in the name of God?

381. SECOND ARGUMENT. Taken from unity of doctrine or belief. We have proven that this unity is necessary (see n. 313–317). Now it is impossible that there should not arise in the Church controversies as to questions of faith or morals. The history of heresies proves that such controversies have arisen at all periods of the Church's existence. How could these controversies be ultimately decided if there did not exist an authority to decide them in a peremptory and infallible manner? Without this infallibility, no decision would ever put an end to controversy, and unity of doctrine or belief would be an actual impossibility.

382. The following reflections will give additional strength to the author's argument, and anticipate the answer to certain difficulties against this dogma of the Catholic Church believed in all Christian ages, and solemnly defined by the Vatican Council in recent times (A. D. 1870).

All Christian believers are agreed on the fundamental historical fact that the Redeemer of the world constituted and appointed a body of teachers whom He authorized, commissioned and charged to convey the Gospel to all future generations, thus to extend and apply to all men the fruits of redemption, which was wrought for the salvation of the whole human race (Matthew xxviii, 18, 19, 20). Now this body of teachers, having been divinely commissioned to teach, must at the same time have received from God a guarantee of always being able to teach the truth; in other words, they must be infallible in their teaching, for an error in matters of religion may lead to eternal ruin. As the eminent Dr. Brownson has remarked, the divine commission to teach naturally carries with it the divine pledge of infallibility in teaching, for it is repugnant to reason and common sense to suppose that Almighty God can authorize a Church to teach without rendering her competent to teach. But a fallible Church, a Church liable to deceive or be deceived, is not competent to teach. Moreover, unless we suppose that God is indifferent as to what we believe or do in matters of religious wor-

ship, and that truth and error are equally acceptable in His sight, we must say that the command to teach implies the obligation of obedience on the part of those who are taught, for authority and submission are correlative terms; therefore all nations and individuals are bound to obey and believe the teachers that are divinely commissioned, and the penalty for disobedience is equal to the punishment to be meted out to wilful idolators and dishonest publicans, for Jesus Christ says in his Gospel: "If he will not hear the Church, let him be to thee as the heathen and the publican." (Matthew xviii, 17.)

But again, it is repugnant to say that God imposes on man under the pain of sin and damnation the duty to believe a fallible teacher, one who may both deceive and be deceived; for then we should be obliged to believe falsehood on pain of disbelieving God, and God, who is truth itself, would make belief in falsehood essential to salvation—a supposition not less impious than absurd.

Therefore, when we assert that God authorized the Church to teach, we say only in other words, that He holds Himself responsible for what she teaches. He vouches for the truth of her testimony, and if she could err, mistake or misrepresent the truth, God would become responsible for error, and authorize and sanction the teachers of falsehood, which is blasphemy to suppose; for, mark well, in matters of religious faith, it is a question not of *exterior* submission only, but also of an *interior* assent. I know full well that the divine law and the principle of order compel me to submit even to an unjust sentence of a civil tribunal, if it cannot be evaded by any lawful means, even though I may be certain that the judge was deceived by perjured witnesses; but no law, whether human or divine, commands me to believe that the verdict was right and the sentence just. Whilst in point of dogmatical teaching from His commissioned messengers, God enjoins a full conviction and interior belief of the doctrines they teach. Hence, if God has founded a Church, and authorized her to teach, she must be able to teach infallibly if she is to teach at all. In this light we can appreciate the full significance of these words of Jesus Christ, addressed to his

Apostles after He had commissioned them to teach: "He that heareth you heareth me. And he that despiseth you despiseth Me, and he that despiseth Me despiseth Him that sent Me" (Luke x, 16).

Therefore the question of infallibility, which is wont to provoke so much animosity, is a very simple thing after all. It is reduced to the question of the divine commission to teach. That fact once established, immunity from error in the authorized teachers follows as a necessary consequence, which no unbiased, reasoning mind can reject.

These two facts, then, being firmly established, viz., the fact of the divine commission and the guarantee of infallibility in executing it even to the consummation of the ages, we have next to face the paramount question which is the final test of all religious discussions, and that is this: Where shall we look in this broad world for that body of teachers divinely commissioned to teach and to teach infallibly? The answer, though a momentous one, thank God, is not far to seek, for when it is question of identifying the ministers of God's Church authorized to teach infallibly we Catholics raise a controversy in which we have no opponent. We vindicate a privilege in which we find no rival claimants. For it is a well known fact that all the dissenting sects, no matter how much they may conflict with one another, are perfectly and unanimously agreed on this point of disclaiming infallibility in their teachers, and they make it one of their chief charges against the Catholic Church that she claims immunity from error in matters of Faith and Morals. By so doing they evidently commit a suicidal act and cut the ground from under their own feet; for they thereby renounce all claim to a divine commission to preach the Gospel of Christ. For it stands to reason to say that the teachers, who by their own confession are fallible, may lead to error and teach falsehood, cannot be supposed to be divinely commissioned, authorized and sent by God to teach men the truth. To such men are applied the words of the Lord in the twenty-third chapter of Jeremiah: "I did not send them, yet they ran; I did not speak to them, yet they prophesied." Hence,

St. Paul writes: "Faith cometh by hearing; how shall they hear without a preacher, and how shall they preach unless they be sent?" (Romans, x, 14-15). Therefore, all so-called ministers and teachers of the Gospel, that are confessedly fallible, have not the divine assistance preserving them from error, and are, consequently, by their own admission, blind guides, and our blessed Lord said in His Gospel (Matth. xv, 14) "that if the blind lead the blind both fall into the pit." In this question, then, of infallibility of the Church, the free and spontaneous concession of our adversaries dispenses us from all further proof. They themselves give in and surrender the point at the very outset and it is superfluous to endeavor to prove what is already granted. And whoever knows anything of the religious dissensions, the contradictory teachings and endless doctrinal changes, that have taken place during the last three centuries outside of the pale of the Catholic Church, will at once understand how the prudence of the serpent induced our adversaries to disclaim all infallibility. "Truth is one," said Bossuet, addressing the heretics, "eternal and immutable, you change, therefore you err."

To resume my argument in brief: There exists upon earth a body of teachers divinely commissioned; and teachers divinely commissioned must be infallible; all Christian sects disclaim infallibility, and consequently, the divine commission; therefore, the Catholic Church alone is in possession of such a gift; therefore, she alone has the right to teach; therefore, she is truly the pillar and the ground of truth. (I. Tim. iii, 15.)

Catholics maintain, then, first, that in the Church of Christ there is a teaching authority divinely established; second, that this authority is infallible within the sphere of all matters concerning faith and morals; third, that this infallibility resides both in the whole teaching body of the Church, the Bishops presided over by the Pope, and the Pope alone whenever he speaks ex-cathedra, that is, as the Teacher of the Universal Church, defining doctrines that are to be held by all Catholics as divinely revealed. And so long as each individual, Bishop, priest or layman, teaches and believes what

is taught and believed by the Church and the chief Pastor, their doctrine and belief partake of the very infallibility of the Church herself, and of the Supreme Pontiff, the seat and center of Catholic truth. Many of our keen adversaries have felt the cogency of this reasoning; hence, all their efforts are invariably directed to this point, viz., to detect, if possible, one single error, one falsehood or contradiction in the teachings of the Catholic Church, for this would be sufficient to disprove her claim to speak in the name of God, and to brand her authority as a tyranny and her infallibility as an imposture. The enemy of the Catholic Church knows full well that one contradiction in her doctrine, one dogmatic decision opposed to another, one definition inconsistent with reason, clearly and plainly established, and the castle of Rome would fall to the ground and crumble into dust. But the Almighty has spoken. "The gates of hell shall not prevail against her." (Matt. xvi, 18.) And the divine assistance, which has baffled until now the impotent attacks of all the enemies of the Catholic Church, shall continue, even to the end of time, to foil their impious attempts. Hence, the Catholic Church, conscious as she is of her divine mission and of her immunity from error in everything that concerns eternal salvation, viz., in everything that falls within the sphere of moral teaching and dogmatic belief, addresses to all men the words of Jesus Christ, her Founder: "You shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." (John viii, 32.) Free indeed, with the freedom of the children of God; for her unerring voice teaches men their eternal happy destiny and the means to attain it.

References—1. Brownson's Works, Vol. 5; "Faith not Possible Without the Church," p. 416-456.

2. Brownson's Works, Vol. 8; "The Great Commission," p. 359–378.

SECOND THESIS—Jesus Christ Has, as a Matter of Fact, Really Instituted in His Church an Authority Infallible in Its Dogmatic and Moral Teaching.

383. When Jesus Christ sent His Apostles throughout

the whole world to call souls to truth and salvation, He addressed to them these words: "All power is given to Me in heaven and in earth; Going, therefore, teach ye all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; and behold I am with you all days,even to the consummation of the world (Matt., xxviii, 18, 19, 20). "As the Father hath sent Me, I also, send you" (John xx, 21). "Go ye into the whole world, and preach the Gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved; but he that believeth not, shall be condemned" (Mark xvi, 15). "And I will ask the Father, and He will give you another Paraclete that He may abide with you forever, the spirit of truth . . . (John xiv, 16). And when He, the spirit of truth, is come, He will teach you all truth (John xvi,13). But when the Paraclete cometh, whom I will send you from the Father, the spirit of truth, who procedeth from the Father, He shall give testimony of Me: And you shall give testimony, because you are with Me from the beginning (John xv, 26-27). You are the salt of the earth. . . . You are the light of the world (Matt. v, 13-14). He that heareth you, heareth Me (Luke x, 16.) If he will not hear the Church, let him be to thee as the heathen and the publican (Matt. xviii, 17). I will give you a mouth and wisdom, which all your adversaries shall not be able to resist and gainsay" (Luke xxi, 15).

Hence, it is evident: Jesus Christ has established *perfect solidarity* between Himself and those whom He commanded to teach to the world the truth that saves. He promised to them, in the most solemn manner, His special assistance in the teaching which He enjoined upon them, and He affirms that this assistance will last *until the end of time*. But this assistance is assured also to their legitimate successors. At all events, it is plain that men in all future time, as well as in the past ages, require religious knowledge, safe from all danger of error.

We do not deem it necessary here to appeal to *Tradition*. Moreover, Protestants, our opponents in the present ques-

tion, are forced to yield to inevitable evidence, and to acknowledge that from the V. to the XVI. century, the Fathers and theologians have always professed the Catholic dogma of infallibility. We draw therefrom the conclusion that such was also the doctrine of the four first centuries; for such an important change could not have been effected without arousing a formidable opposition, either on the part of the Bishops and the Faithful, or more particularly on the part of heretics.

Moreover, the whole history of the Church, the respect always entertained for the decisions of the four first ecumenical Councils, as well as for the subsequent ones, show sufficiently what has been, at all times, the tradition of the Church on this doctrinal point.

We shall soon prove that this privilege bestowed on the the Church was personally granted to her Supreme Head, the Roman Pontiff.

II. Object of Infallibility or Matters on Which It Is Exercised.

384. The doctrinal authority of the Church is not unlimited; it is, on the contrary, confined within the very precise limits of revelation coming from God; it bears only on the deposit of revealed doctrine and on what is necessary for the preservation of this deposit. By these limits the extent of infallibility is measured.

Its object then comprises: 1. The teaching of the dogmas or truths of Faith that are to be believed.

2. The teaching of morality or of the moral truths and principles to be reduced to practice.

3. Matters of general discipline, in so far as they touch upon Faith or morals.

4. Dogmatic facts, that is to say, facts so closely connected with dogma, that they cannot be called in question without undermining dogma itself. These are, for instance, the declarations and statements of errors contained in writings upon which the Church passes judgment, as without this

certainty the Church could not, as in duty bound, preserve from the poison of error the flock confided to her care.

Hence, when we speak of the extent of the inerrancy of the Church, we must bear in mind the following proposition, viz. "It is no article of Catholic Faith that the Church cannot err, either in matters of fact not relating to Faith, or in matters of changeable discipline concerning things alterable by the circumstances of time and place, and, therefore, not connnected with either faith or morals; or in matters of speculation, or civil policy, depending on mere human judgment, or testimony. These things are not *revelations deposited in the Church*, in regard *to which alone* she has the promised assistance of the Holy Spirit. (See "Faith of Catholics," Vol. 1, p. 468.)

Remarks. 1. Infallibility does not come from a divine inspiration, properly so-called (see n. 352), nor from a new revelation, but from a special heavenly assistance, imparted either to the Bishops united with the Pope, or to the Supreme Pastor, enabling them to understand and expound the revelations made by Jesus Christ. This assistance is far from rendering researches, discussions, human labor and study useless. It is only after having made use of every means that would preclude the danger of acting with temerity; it is only after having studied with the greatest care the two sources of revelation, the Scripture and Tradition, that the Church or the Pope declares as revealed a truth implicitly contained up to that time in the deposit of revelation.

Again, though infallible, the Pope is not inspired; far from it. "No Pope" writes Cardinal Hergenrother (Anti-Janus p. 73) "has ever attributed to himself *inspiration*, but divine assistance only."

According to Catholic theology, the gift of inspiration implies four things: (1) *A divine illumination* of the mind of the teacher, by which the truth to be taught and recorded is directly and immediately communicated to him; (2) *a divine impulse* to his will, which directly and efficaciously (without, however, destroying his liberty) determines him to write or

speak; (3)*a divine direction*, to insure that the inspired agent faithfully teaches *all* that and *only* that which God wishes him to teach by writing, or word of mouth; and (4) *a divine assistance* to the end that the truths supernaturally conceived are correctly expressed. Infallibility, on the other hand, merely implies *a divine assistance*, which guarantees to the Pope immunity from all liability to err, when officially teaching the Universal Church as her Supreme Pastor. Infallibility, then, agrees with inspiration in the fourth point only; in the other three it altogether differs from it. Hence, it is that though there can be no inspiration without infallibility, yet there can be infallibility without inspiration.

2. Infallibility differs essentially from *impeccability*, which consists in not being capable of sinning; this signal privilege, granted to the Most Holy Virgin Mary, has never been considered as having been attributed to the Sovereign Pontiff.

Infallibility means exemption from liability to err; it does not mean merely freedom from actual error, but it, moreover, implies freedom from the *possibility* of erring. Infallibility is not to be confounded with impeccability; the former excludes the possibility of error in the *interpretation* of revealed Faith and moral law; the latter excludes the possibility of sin in the *observance* of the law. Neither is infallibility a quality inherent in any person, but is an *assistance* attached to an office, and its function is not the discovery of new religious truths, but the interpretation, the expounding and the guardianship of old ones.

III. Subject of Infallibility, or on Whom it Resides.

§ I. Infallibility of the Teaching Church.

385. To say that the Church is infallible in her teaching is equivalent to saying that the body of pastors, united to the Pope, the Supreme Head of the Church, is infallible, whether they be assembled in the solemn sittings of an ecumenical Council, or remain dispersed throughout the world.

Let us remark, moreover, that to be ecumenical or general, a Council must have been convoked or approved as such by

the Pope, to whom belongs the right to preside over it, either personally or by his delegates. If a Council had been convoked by the Pope or with his approbation, and if subsequently the Head of the Church should separate himself from it, the Council would then become an assemblage without a head and could no longer do anything; should it obstinately continue its labors, it would be nothing more than a conciliabulum; viz., an illegitimate conventicle, whose decrees and definitions would be null and void.

§ II. Infallibility of the Roman Pontiff.

386. When He speaks as Head of the Church, with the fullness of his doctrinal authority, the Sovereign Pontiff possesses, *in his person alone*, the same infallibility as the whole teaching Church, or as the whole episcopal body. This is the belief of the Church, a belief held and acted upon as certain at all times, and which was declared to be a dogma of Catholic Faith by the definition of the Vatican Council. These are the terms of that definition:

"This gift of truth and never-failing Faith was conferred by heaven upon Peter and his successors in this Chair, that they might perform their high office for the salvation of all; that the whole flock of Christ, kept away by them from the poisonous food of error, might be nourished with the pasture of heavenly doctrine; that, the occasion of schism being removed, the whole Church might be kept one, and, resting on its foundation, might stand firm against the gates of hell. . . .

Therefore faithfully adhering to the tradition received from the beginning of the Christian Faith, for the glory of God Our Savior, the exaltation of the Catholic Religion, and the salvation of Christian people, the Sacred Council approving, we teach and define that it is a dogma divinely revealed; that the Roman Pontiff, when he speaks *ex-cathedra*, that is, when in the discharge of the office of Pastor and Doctor of all Christians, by virtue of his Supreme Apostolic authority, he defines a doctrine regarding faith or morals to be held by the Universal Church, by the divine assistance promised to him in blessed Peter, is possessed of that infallibility with

which the divine Redeemer willed that His Church should be endowed for defining doctrine regarding faith or morals; and that, therefore, such definitions of the Roman Pontiff are irreformable of themselves, and not from the consent of the Church.

But if anyone— which may God avert—presume to contradict this our definition; let him be anathema.

Given at Rome in Public Session solemnly held in the Vatican Basilica in the year of Our Lord one thousand eight hundred and seventy, on the eighteenth day of July, in the twenty-fifth year of our Pontificate."[1]

We shall content ourselves with indicating a few of the proofs on which the doctrine of the Council is founded.

---

1 This definition achieved the happy result of putting an end to the errors of Gallicanism. The Sorbonne—University of Paris—from the time of Gerson, has never been unsuspiciously favorable to the doctrine of the absolute supremacy of the Pope in the Church. Such opinions, quite extensively spread among the French clergy, were organized and formed into a politico-religious system under the reign of Louis XIV., in the year 1682.

We shall say a word about the circumstances under which such deliberations were adopted. After some controversies with the Court of Rome, Louis XIV., with the intention of humiliating the Pope convoked a meeting of Bishops, in which, under the direction and leadership of Bossuet, there was issued a declaration, in four articles, of which the following is the last: "Though the Pope has the principal part in questions of faith, and his decrees concern all the Churches and each of them in particular, yet his judgment is not irreformable or exempt from revision unless there should intervene the consent (explicit or tacit) of the Church herself." This article never had any doctrinal value. Only 34 prelates out of 135 signed this declaration. The others never gave it their adhesion, and even opposed it with irresistible vigor and logic. In the same year, 1682, it was condemned by the solemn disapproval of Pope Innocent XI., who annulled all the acts of this assembly. It was again and more expressly condemned by Alexander VIII. in 1690 and by Pius VI. in 1794. Moreover, the Bishops, who had signed the declaration openly disavowed it, and even Bossuet himself, who had drawn it up, decided not to defend it. Finally Louis XIV. submitted in his turn by suspending the execution of the decree regarding some new ecclesiastical laws. However, the Gallican error did not thereby become extinct; it lifted up its head with a certain violence at the time of the Vatican Council, but this was its last agonizing effort. After the definition, all that were previously opposed to the doctrine of infallibility and those that deemed its definition inopportune, with few exceptions, accepted the decree in perfect submission, giving once more to the world the spectacle, so often renewed, of the wonderful power and indestructible unity of the Roman Catholic Church, the only true Church of Jesus Christ.

In connection with the present subject we remember this incident: On the 18th day of July, A. D. 1870, more than 60 Cardinals and 800

THESIS—When the Sovereign Pontiff Speaks ex-Cathedra, that is, as Head of the Church, in the Plenitude of His Doctrinal Authority, He is Endowed with Infallibility.

387. First Argument. Taken from Sacred Scripture.

a. "And I say to thee: Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build My Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it."(Matt. xvi, 18.) It follows from these words that the Pope, one of whose *essential* functions is to teach the truths revealed by Jesus Christ, is necessarily infallible. It is on him that the Church rests as her foundation; it is from him that she draws her stability, her perpetuity. Now, the stability of a religious society depends above all *upon unity of faith*; her perpetuity supposes exemption from all error in propounding and interpreting that Faith. How, in fact, could this constant, consistent and unbroken unity be possible, if Peter, the foundation of the spiritual edifice, could err as to the truths, which he enjoins upon the belief of all the Faithful? If, by his teaching, the Pope could lead the Faithful into error, the devil, the father of lies, therefore hell itself, would have prevailed against the Church and against her Head.

b. "Feed My lambs, feed My sheep." (St. John xxi, 15.) These words, addressed to Peter alone, conferred upon him the mission to feed the lambs and the sheep, that is, the Faithful and those who are their spiritual Fathers, hence, all the members of the Church. But the nourishment or food of souls is the truth; if Peter were not infallible, if he could not discern with certainty truth from error in matters of faith, he would infect with the poison of error the flock, which is confided to him; he would lead it on the way of perdition.

Archbishops and Bishops, and an immense multitude of people, representing every country of the world, were gathered in St. Peter's. While the Supreme Pontiff, Pius IX, was reading the decree defining the infallibility of the Church and of her visible Head, the Vicar of Christ, a terrific storm, accompanied by thunder and lightning, was prevailing in Rome. A French Bishop, turning to a neighboring prelate, said, "This is Mount Sinai over again." "No," replied the witty prelate, "but it is the funeral of Gallicanism."—R. I. P.

388. SECOND ARGUMENT. Derived from Tradition. If the Scriptures are clear as to the present question, Tradition is, perhaps, still more explicit. The reader can find a great number of texts of the Holy Fathers and of Councils, in the 73rd Conference of Fr. Olivier and in "L'Infaillibilité" (Infallibility) by Card. Deschamps.

References—1. "The Faith of Catholics," vol. 2, p. 1–108; vol. 3, p. 451–460.

2. Lindsay, "Evidence for the Papacy."

3. Rev. Thomas E. Cox, "The Pillar and Ground of the Truth," ch., vi "The Infallibility of the Church;" Chicago, J. S. Hyland & Co., 1900.

4. "The True Faith of our Forefathers," ch. vii and xi.

5. Rev. Charles Coupe, S. J., "Where is the True Church?" Lect. III, V and VIII; Catholic Truth Society, London, 1900.

We shall simply mention this fact, which is decisive in itself, that, *at all times*, the Sovereign Pontiffs have used this their prerogative, by condemning heresies throughout the whole world, acting in this by the authority which belongs exclusively to them and without convoking a general or ecumenical Council, and that their decisions have been accepted as infallible by the whole Church. It is St. Augustin who first used the significant words, so often repeated since his day: "*Roma locuta est, causa finita est*" (Rome has spoken, the cause is ended). Before him, St. Ambrose had used another expression, admitted also as an axiom: "*Ubi est Petrus, ibi Ecclesia*" (Where Peter is, there is the Church). (See n. 360.)[1]

[1] If it be asked, how is it that, as to a truth so firmly established and universally admitted, Gallicanism was possible, we will answer in the first place that political motives can blind even the best minds; moreover, the Gallicans, without perceiving it, started from an hypothesis that was false and absolutely impossible. They supposed the Pope to be speaking in one sense and the whole Church being of a contrary mind on the same question, or point of doctrine. Hence, they could not understand that the decision of the Pope alone could prevail against that of the whole Church. But this is a supposition that can never be realized, because the definition of the Supreme Head of the Church cannot be other than the expression of the traditional belief of the Church. It is known, for instance, that when it

IV. Conditions of Infallibility.

389. We have seen, when speaking of infallibility, what is required in order that a Council may be ecumenical or general, and consequently infallible. There remains to determine *in what circumstances* the Pope is infallible, that is, *when* in his teaching he is exempt from error. For this purpose, let us examine the very terms of the decision of the Vatican Council of 1870.

According to the Holy Council, in order that the Pope be speaking *ex-Cathedra*, and therefore held to be infallible in his utterances, it is necessary: 1, That he be acting by virtue of his supreme authority and as Head of the Universal Church; 2, that he have the intention to *issue a definition*, intention that must be deducible either from the terms, which he employs, for instance, if he uses the words, *We define*; if he fulminates anathema against the contrary doctrine; or lastly, from the circumstances in which he speaks.

In a word, the Pope speaks *ex-Cathedra* every time that he makes known his intention to bind the Faithful to accept what he teaches in matters of faith or morals.

It follows from this that the opinions, the writings and the acts of the Pope, as a private individual, do not enjoy in any manner the privilege of infallibility. Thus the allocutions of the Sovereign Pontiff to the deputations which he receives are not acts *ex-Cathedra*.

Let us add that infallibility affects only the definition itself, and not the considerations or the arguments, whether Scriptural, philosophical or historical, which generally form the preliminaries of dogmatic definitions.

References.—Infallibility being by far the most vital point of Christian doctrine, we are not surprised at the multitude of controversial works written on this subject. We shall

was question of defining the dogma of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin, the Universal Church, when consulted as to her belief, answered by the voice of all her pastors that she believed in the immunity of the Mother of God from original sin. One Bishop alone thought otherwise, but he hastened, on the proclamation of the definition to give his adhesion to the dogma.

here quote some of the leading productions that have come to our knowledge.

1. "Christianity and Infallibility, Both or Neither," by the Rev. Daniel Lyons; Longmans, Green & Co., New York, 1891. An excellent and exhaustive treatise, to which we may with truth apply the old saying, "Beware of the Reader of one Book" "Cave a Lectore unius libri."

2. "The Bible and Its Interpreter," by Rev. P. H. Casey, S. J., Professor of Dogmatic Theology in Woodstock College, Md.; John J. McVey, Philadelphia, 1900.

3. "The Shortest Way to End Disputes about Religion," published in 1716. Author unknown.

4. "Christian Apology," by Paul Schanz, 3rd vol., ch. 8 and 14.

5. "The Credentials of the Catholic Church," by Rev. J. N. Bagshawe; R. Washbourne, London, 1879.

6. "The Divine Plan of the Church," by Rev. John McLaughlin; Burns and Oates, London, 1901.

7. "Irish Ecclesiastical Record," vol. ix, 1901 et seqq. An able series of articles in refutation of Dr. Salmon's (Protestant) Lectures on the Infallibility of the Church.

8. Brownson's Works, vol. 13; "Papal Infallibility."

ART. IV.—RELATIONS BETWEEN CHURCH AND STATE.

390. The Church has received from Jesus Christ all the powers necessary to attain her end, and all men must, in order to be saved, belong to her and obey her laws. (See ch. iv, n. 5.) On the other hand, man, being a social being, naturally forms part of civil society, which has also received from God the necessary powers to realize its own end and rightfully exacts obedience to its laws.

It is important to know what relations should exist, by the will of God, between these two societies composed of the same members; in other words, to know precisely the reciprocal rights and duties of the Church and of the State.

Leo XIII., in his admirable Encyclical, "Immortale Dei," on *The Christian Constitution of States* (A. D. 1885), has set

them forth in the clearest light. We shall cite some passages from it; and then recapitulate this doctrine in a few words. We will in this way help to determine with precision what are the true ideas to be entertained as to this important question. This is especially necessary at the present time, when men endeavor to thwart and shackle the Church in the exercise of her authority and to subject her to the powers of the earth.

"God," says Pope Leo XIII., "has divided the government of mankind between two powers; the ecclesiastical power and the civil power; the one designed for heavenly, the other for earthly interests. Each of them is sovereign in its own sphere, each of them is confined within limits perfectly defined and traced in conformity with its nature and special purpose. There is, therefore, a circumscribed sphere within which each of them exercises its action, *jure proprio*, through its own right. However, as their authority is wielded over the same subject, it may happen that one and the same thing, though from a different cause, may be under the jurisdiction and judgment of both powers. It is, therefore, necessary that there should be between both powers a well defined system of relations, not without analogy with the relations, which in man constitute the union of the soul and of the body. We can form a correct idea of the nature and influence of these relations only by considering the character of each of these two powers, and by taking account of the excellence and nobility of their respective object or purpose, because, whilst the one has for its proximate and special end to concern itself with earthly interests, the other, on the contrary, aims at serving the eternal. Thus everything that in human affairs is sacred for any cause whatsoever, everything that refers to the salvation of souls and the worship of God, either by its intrinsic nature or on account of its end, all this evidently belongs to the authority of the Church. As to things embraced in the civil and political order, it is but just that they should be subject to civil authority because Jesus Christ has commanded to render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and to God the things that are God's."

Previous to this, in his Encyclical *Diuturnum illud* (A. D. 1881), Leo XIII., had said: "The Church acknowledges and declares that everything which belongs to the civil order is under the power and supreme authority of secular rulers. In matters, the judgment of which belongs, for various reasons, both to the religious and to the civil authority, the Church desires that there should be a mutual agreement, through whose beneficent influence fatal dissensions are spared to both of them."

As early as the year 492, viz., 1410 years ago, the same principles were laid down by a predecessor of the reigning Pontiff. "Two powers govern the world," writes Pope Gelasius to the Greek Emperor Anastasius; "the spiritual authority of the Roman Pontiff, and the temporal power of Kings." These powers have for their end, one the spiritual happiness of man here and hereafter, the other, the temporal prosperity of society in the present world. This distinction of powers is an essentially Christian principle, in direct opposition to the Pagan axiom "cuius est regio, illius est religio" (the religion of a country is that of its ruler), a formula of abject servitude to a power, to which the divine Lawgiver committed no spiritual authority; a formula of revolt against those whom Christ invested with the fullness of religious authority for the government of souls. The two powers are indeed essentially distinct; but they are, by no means, hostile. Far from it; they have reciprocal duties, the performance of which affords them a mutual support. They are like two cogwheels, producing uniform motion so long as they work harmoniously or regularly into each other. If the temporal power, as in duty bound, causes the spiritual authority to be respected, and refrains from meddling with things beyond its competence, the spiritual authority, on its side, recognizes, in the temporal prince, a power that comes from God, and, by imposing on its subjects, both interior and exterior submission, vindicates the majesty of the law, secures the triumph of order, and the stability of thrones and States. This is the basis of the Christian organization of society, as well as the guarantee of the dignity of man. (See "Fact Devine," by Broeckaert, S. J., ch. xiv.)

FIRST THESIS—THE ECCLESIASTICAL POWER AND THE CIVIL POWER, CHURCH AND STATE, ARE INDEPENDENT OR SOVEREIGN, EACH WITHIN THE LIMITS OF ITS OWN SPHERE OF ACTION.

I. Independence of the Spiritual Power.

391. FIRST ARGUMENT. Taken from the expressed will of Jesus Christ. It was to St. Peter and to his successors that Jesus Christ confided the government of His Church. "It is to the Church and not to the State," says Leo XIII., in his encyclical *Immortale Dei* (A. D. 1885), "that it belongs to guide men to celestial things; it is to the Church that God has given the command to take cognizance of and to decide everything that relates to religion, to teach all nations, to extend, as far as possible, the frontiers of the Christian name; in a word, to administer freely and as she sees fit, the Christian interests of the souls confided to her care." It is evident that to attempt to subject the Church to any other power than that which God has established, would be to strive to overthrow the work of God Himself.

392. SECOND ARGUMENT. Taken from the more exalted end or purpose of the Church. Civil Society has for its direct object the securing to man of material comforts and protection, to aid him in the preservation and development of his natural faculties and resources in the civil and intellectual order. Religious Society, or the Church, has for its special end to enable man to reach perfect and eternal happiness. To establish and spread the kingdom of God upon earth, to labor for the moral and supernatural perfection of man, to lead him to his supreme destiny, to secure to him the boundless happiness which consists in the eternal possession of God; all this evidently constitutes a mission immensely superior to that which belongs to civil power. "As the chief end of the Church is much more noble than all other purposes," says Leo XIII., "it naturally follows that her power excels all other powers and it can in nowise be reckoned as inferior, or subject, or subordinate to the civil power."

393. THIRD ARGUMENT. Deduced from the conduct of Jesus Christ and His Apostles. Nowhere do we find Jesus Christ asking of the temporal rulers leave or authorization to preach, to assemble His disciples, to establish His Church. Nowhere also does He command His Apostles to come to any agreement with civil governments for the preaching of the Gospel and the exercise of their ministry. He foretells to them, on the contrary, that they will be persecuted and cruelly treated by rulers and magistrates because of their mission. Hence, we see that the Apostles announce everywhere the good tidings of salvation, they found churches, appoint Bishops, priests, deacons, enact disciplinary laws, obligatory on the Faithful, without ever concerning themselves in any way as to the powers of the world; if expelled from one place, they go to another; if they suffer injuries and cruel treatment, they rejoice for having suffered for the name of Christ. "And they, indeed, went from the presence of the Council rejoicing that they were accounted worthy to suffer for the name of Jesus." (Acts v, 41.) They simply say: "We cannot but speak the things which we have seen and heard." (Acts iv, 20.)

The Acts of the Apostles give us a striking example of this independence of the spiritual power. The Jewish magistrates forbid the Apostles to preach the doctrine of Jesus, because, they say, they thereby disturb the public peace. What is their answer? "We ought to obey God rather than men." (Acts v, 29.) Behold here facing each other two conflicting powers; on the one hand the Church, who insists on her right and duty of preaching the Gospel in order to realize her end, the salvation of souls, a matter of strictly spiritual interest; and on the other, the civil magistrates who forbid this preaching under the pretext of thus securing public peace, a matter of purely temporal interest. And the Holy Ghost by the voice of Peter declares that the Church must not trouble herself about this prohibition. The inspired writer does not give any assurance that public order will not be troubled; he merely asserts the express will of God, that Christ's Gospel should be preached everywhere.

394. FOURTH ARGUMENT. Borrowed from ecclesiastical history. The example of the Apostles has been faithfully followed by their successors in the Apostolate, not only during the long period of sanguinary persecution, but throughout all the past ages. As the above quoted Encyclical tells us: "This authority, perfect and dependent only on its divine Author, the Church never ceased to claim as her own, and to exercise it publicly without fear. Much more can she invoke, in principle and as a matter of historical precedent, the assent of rulers and heads of states, who in their negotiations and transactions, by the reciprocal sending of ambassadors and the exchange of other good offices, have always dealt with the Church as with a sovereign and legitimate power. And it was not without a particular disposition of Providence, we may say, that this authority was provided with a civil principality or kingdom as the best safeguard of its independence in the exercise of its lofty functions." (See ch. iv., 8, 9.)

REMARK.—There is nothing in common between the superiority of jurisdiction, of which we have just spoken, and *theocracy*, with which opponents strive to confound it. Theocracy, *which is the government of a civil society by a political law divinely revealed and by an authority established by God Himself*, never existed except among the Jewish people, and that only during a certain period of its history. It is true that frequently our adversaries designate by the name of theocracy a pretended domination, which they endeavor to attribute to the clergy in things purely temporal. But the Catholic doctrine, by proclaiming, as we shall now see, the absolute independence of the civil power in this matter, renders such domination altogether impossible.

II. Independence of the Civil Power.

395. Let the State adopt whatever measures it may desire in the matter of custom duties, taxation, the army, public works, etc., as long as it does not infringe upon the laws of God, and the rights of the Church; and the spiritual interests and chief end of man are not endangered by its leg-

islation, the Church has nothing to say as to these purely secular matters, which concern only the temporal happiness of the people. In other words, the Church has not, nor does she claim, by virtue of her institution, any power over civil society in matters purely temporal, which are connected only with earthly interests. "Civil order," says Leo XIII. in speaking of rulers, "is entirely subject to their power and sovereign authority." (See 5th conf. of Father Monsabré, 1882.)

COROLLARIES. 1. It follows from the preceding thesis, that there exists between Church and State a *real distinction*, intended by Jesus Christ. Let us, however, state at the same time that this distinction between the two powers is not *rigorously essential.* For God *could have confided to the same authority* at the same time the double task of securing the temporal and the spiritual end of man. He *might also* have constituted the kings of the earth lieutenants of the Head of the Church, receiving their powers from him and governing in His name; but He did not so will. In reality Jesus Christ willed that each one of those two ends should be procured by a special authority, distinct and independent in its own sphere of action.

2. From what we have said about the powers conferred by Jesus Christ upon His Church, and the independence which he guaranteed to her with regard to civil authority, it follows, by virtue of the definition already given, that the Church is truly *a perfect society.* Hence, also follows the condemnation of pagan Cæsarism and all the encroachments of the civil power upon the liberty of the Church, which history records.

English History, since the Reformation, furnishes several instances of unwarranted interference in Church matters on the part of political rulers. The following will suffice: The Anglican Bishop Cox was once honored with a short, but very significant encyclical from Queen Elizabeth, a document the like of which, for its claim to spiritual power, and its arrogance, has never been issued by any Boniface or Hildebrand of the Catholic Church:

"Proud Prelate—You know what you were before I made you what you are now. If you do not immediately comply with my request, I will unfrock you, by G—d.

"ELIZABETH."

(Strickland's "Queens of England," vol. vi, p. 234.)

Rights of the Church.

396. It will not be out of place to enumerate here some of the rights which the Church justly and lawfully claims. To deprive the Church of any of these rights, is to attack the independence, which belongs to her as a perfect society, possessing in herself, according to the sovereign command of Jesus Christ, her Founder, all the means necessary for her preservation and action in order to attain her end.

A. The Church has the right to fulfill freely her mission and to exercise the powers that she received from her divine Founder, without having to ask the authorization of the civil power, nor can she be subjected to its control or intervention. Accordingly, it depends upon herself alone, in all that concerns the teaching of dogma and morals, the administration of the sacraments, the election of her Pontiffs, the founding and governing of seminaries and religious communities, the conferring of ecclesiastical offices, etc. No one has the right to prevent the Sovereign Pontiff from communicating with the clergy and the Faithful, nor to impede the promulgation of his decrees, nor to prevent the execution of his Encyclical Letters, called bulls. The so-called *royal placet* and *exequatur*, by which civil rulers sometimes claim to have the right to control the acts of the spiritual power, are illicit and invalid, unless they be the results of a concordat, that is to say, of a *concession* freely made by the ecclesiastical authority itself.

B. As every member of the Church is composed of a double nature, a body and a soul, he is to be led to his last end by means appropriate to that double nature. Hence, it follows:

a. That the Church has the right to prescribe to her members not only things purely interior and spiritual but

also things external and corporal, such as fasting, alms-giving, attendance at Church services, etc.

b. That she has the right and the obligation, derived from her Founder, to exercise outwardly and publicly divine worship and consequently to prescribe exterior and public ceremonies, such as processions, pilgrimages. She has the right to procure the material means necessary for the exercise of worship, the support of her ministers, the construction and preservation of sacred edifices; and since temporal possessions are absolutely necessary to her, she has the right to acquire and own them as her legitimate property, which the secular power is bound to protect.

c. The Church has the right to exact obedience from her members, to constrain rebels to submission by spiritual as well as by corporal penalties, both for their own correction and reform, and for the example and warning of others.

SECOND THESIS.—In Case of Conflict, that is to say, when in mixed Questions, the two Authorites impose upon their Subjects, who are the same Persons, contradictory Obligations, the Power of the Church should prevail over that of the State.

397. In temporal matters there are cases in which there intervenes, either regularly or exceptionally, *a spiritual interest to be safeguarded by the Church*, although the matters in question may not be completely transferred to her domain on account of some spiritual interest at stake. This, for instance, is the case as to the temporal possessions of the Church. They are called "mixed things." "Everything, says Leo XIII., "which in human affairs is sacred by whatsoever title, everything which concerns the salvation of souls and the worship of God, either through its nature or with respect to its end, all these things belong to the authority of the Church." In all this the Church finds herself within the sphere of her own jurisdiction, and consequently she has *the right* to exercise her authority, as well towards governments as towards private individuals. Moreover, history attests that in questions of this nature, the Church always endeavors to come to an amicable understanding with the

State, with a view to settle these questions by a common agreement, rather than to decide them by acts of her supreme authority. Let us add the following words from the Encyclical already quoted above:

"There are times when there prevails another way of securing concord, and guaranteeing peace and liberty. Heads of States and the Sovereign Pontiffs come to an agreement by a *treaty* as to some particular point. Under these circumstances the Church gives striking proofs of her maternal charity by extending as far as possible her indulgent condescensions."

The present thesis is a logical deduction from the preceding one. However, because of its importance in the times in which we live, it is advisable to insist upon some of the arguments usually alleged in its support.

398. First Argument. Taken from the very purpose or end of the Church. This purpose is infinitely more important than that of the State. What, indeed, are, after all, temporal goods compared to those of eternity? "What doth it profit a man," says our Lord, "if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul?" (Matth. xvi, 26.) All the goods of this earth, and *civil society itself*, are evidently nothing else but *means* given by God to man to lead him to the supreme and eternal goal, to the possession of heavenly happiness. Governments, having as their own and immediate purpose the temporal happiness of man, should, therefore, *in all things which concern the last end of man*, be subordinate to the Church. "The art of the pilot," says St. Thomas, "rules that of the sailor, the architect that of the mason, and the arts of peace those of war."

399. Second Argument. Taken from Catholic tradition and pontifical decisions. "All the Fathers of the Church," says Cardinal Tarquini, S. J. (1874), in his excellent standard work, '*Dissertations on the Public Law of the Church*' (Juris Ecclesiastici Publici Institutiones) "have always taught that the purpose of civil society and its government should be subordinate to the Church, just as the body is subject to the soul." This is also shown by *the decisions of the Holy See.*

Not only has Pius IX. condemned the 42nd proposition of the Syllabus which reads: "In the case of conflict between the two powers, civil law prevails;" but in his celebrated Encyclical *Quanta cura* (Dec. 8, 1864), basing his words on the principles laid down by many of his predecessors, he expresses himself more clearly still: "It is certain that whenever it is a question of divine things, the best interests of earthly rulers would be secured, if they were to adhere to what God has wisely ordained, and submit the royal will to that of the ministers of Christ, and never prefer their own to theirs."

THIRD THESIS.—THE CHURCH AND STATE SHOULD MUTUALLY HELP EACH OTHER.

400. The conflicts, of which we have spoken, are always to be regretted and they invariably prove hurtful to the State, as well as to the Church. Hence it is necessary, as Leo XIII. says, "That there should exist between the two powers a well regulated system of relations, not without analogy to that which in man constitutes the union of soul and body." The wise Providence of God, which has established both powers, has supplied their wants by indicating the relations, which they are to bear to each other. It is these relations that form the object of this thesis, divided into two parts.

I. The Church Owes Assistance and Protection to the State.

401. This duty needs no demonstration, and the Church does not question this obligation, provided there be no denial of her right to determine in a sovereign, independent way its extent and practical bearing. She fulfills this duty by her teaching as to the divine origin of the temporal power and as to the necessity of obedience to all lawful authority; she fulfills it by her prayers, her sacraments and public worship, which furnish to the subjects of the State the moral strength needed to fulfill their civil obligations. The Church should also, in case of necessity, make use of spiritual penalties to compel subjects to fulfill their duty to

the State; finally, there may occur circumstances in which the Church would consider herself obliged to help the State by pecuniary sacrifices, even by the giving up to the civil power a part of her temporal possessions.

The reader will find numerous instances of her generous sacrifices on behalf of the State in that admirable work of Cardinal Baluffi, "The Charity of the Church," ch. v, xv, xvii, xix, and in "Ecclesiastical History."

II. The Temporal Power in its Turn Owes Aid and Assistance to the Church.

402. 1. INDIRECTLY. a. By causing justice, order and tranquility to reign in the State, so as to permit the Church to exercise efficaciously her salutary action in behalf of the people.

b. In being careful not to encroach upon the rights of the Church, and not permitting anyone to interfere with her in the fulfillment of her divine mission, the preaching of the Gospel, the administration of the sacraments, the exercise of religious worship, and in the spiritual government of her flock.

2. DIRECTLY. The State owes to the Church positive and direct assistance, without, however, ever going outside of the sphere that belongs to it. It is its duty, for instance, to place its legislation in harmony with divine and ecclesiastical laws; to sanction, as far as circumstances demand and permit, the laws of the Church, by enforcing temporal penalties on their transgressors; to provide, if necessary, for the support of the clergy and of divine worship.

We shall give a few proofs of this *direct* duty, which is frequently denied.

403. FIRST ARGUMENT. Taken from the very purposes or designs of almighty God. In creating man, God had in view both His own glory and the eternal salvation of His creature, raised by Him to the dignity of His adopted child. It is to secure for Him this happiness, that He sent His Son upon the earth, that He established the Church, and that He

desires her propagation and the freedom, to which she is justly entitled in the discharge of her mission. If, therefore, He delegates a part of His authority to rulers of States, it is not only that they may assure to their subjects peace and prosperity here on earth, it is also that they may help them to reach the supreme goal of their present existence. Hence, every man should desire and seek for the good things of this world only in so far as they help him to obtain eternal happiness. Hence it results that the depositaries of civil power cannot demand obedience, in the name of God, except in view *of this same end.* They should, therefore, labor, as far as circumstances permit and within the limits of their sphere, for the maintenance and progress of the true religion, which alone leads to salvation.

404. SECOND ARGUMENT. Taken from the social royalty of Jesus Christ. Jesus Christ is God, and as absolute sovereignty over everything that exists, belongs essentially to the Deity; He is the King of civil societies as well as of families and their individual members. This royalty has been distinctly proclaimed both in the Old and in the new Testament. "All beings of the earth shall adore Him," says David, "all nations shall serve Him." (Ps. lxxii, 11.) "Kings minister to thee." "The nation and the kingdom that will not serve thee, shall perish" (Is. lx 10-12.) "And He (the Lord) gave him power and glory and a kingdom; and all peoples, tribes and tongues shall serve Him; His power is an everlasting power that shall not be taken away; and His kingdom that shall not be destroyed." (Dan. vii, 14.) "God hath exalted Him," says St. Paul, "and hath given him a name which is above name. That in the name of Jesus every knee should bow of those that are in heaven, in earth and in hell" (Philip. ii, 9-10). "Thou hast put all things in subjection under His feet; He left nothing not subject to Him." (Hebrews ii, 8.) Moreover, the emphatic affirmation of the Savior Himself is well known. "All power is given to me in heaven and in earth." (Matth. xxviii, 18.) By virtue of the authority, which belongs to Him as God, Jesus Christ might have taken into His own hands the *temporal* sceptre

of the whole world, just as He did assume to Himself the spiritual. He did not so will; it pleased Him to leave to rulers power over things purely human. But if His kingdom is not of this world, if He commands men to render to Cæsar what belongs to Cæsar, He cannot permit that man should with impunity refuse to render to God what belongs to God. He made His religion obligatory not only on isolated individuals, but also on civil society itself. Nations like individuals are bound to obey the law of the Gospel, and the holders of political power are obliged in conscience to help as much as they can that God's sovereign will is carried into execution, for "He is the King of Kings, and the Lord of Lords." (Apoc. xix, 16.)

405. THIRD ARGUMENT. Drawn from the interest and well-being of the State itself. The prosperity of the State and the realization of its proper and immediate end, that is, the temporal happiness of its members, require that it should contribute according to its ability to the prosperity of the Church. For without religion no civil society can be permanent and prosperous. It is religion that is its basis, because it explains in an authoritative manner the origin of society and the legitimacy of the social power. It is religion that points out what, in the designs of God, is the firm foundation on which loyal obedience rests, and causes justice, charity, peace and concord to reign among its citizens. Evidently, it is the true religion that is here referred to, that is, the religion which contains all the truths, without mingling of error, the religion that renders to God the legitimate worship due to him and gives to man through the sacraments instituted by Christ, the supernatural strength needed to accomplish his duties to God, to himself and to his fellow men. Such religion becomes thereby the strongest support of the State and contributes most efficaciously to the attainment of its special immediate end, which is the temporal welfare of its subjects.

Above all, religion should preside over civil legislation. All laws must be in harmony with God's eternal law, which is the infallible rule of right and wrong. Deprive political

legislation of this essential condition, and you strip your legislative measures of all validity before God as well as before men. It was for this reason that the great legislators of antiquity pretended to a divine assistance and sanction in framing and promulgating their code. Whoever imagines that he can make laws without regard to religion is more a tyrant than a legislator, for, by ignoring or disregarding the rights of God, he will trample under foot those of man. The immortal Washington, the Father and Founder of the great American Republic, was right when he said in his farewell address to the American Nation that "Religion and Morality are the props of society and the pillars of the State." History tells in its every page that the decline and downfall of nations have ever been caused by immorality and irreligion. This is but the fulfillment of the divine words registered in the book of Proverbs, ch. xiv., v. 34. "Justice exalteth a nation; but sin maketh nations miserable." See the able essay of the late Cardinal Manning entitled, "Without God no Commonwealth," in which he proves that the social and civil commonwealth of mankind has its origin, and still has its perpetuity, in the knowledge of God, and in obedience to Him springing from that knowledge, so that without God no commonwealth is possible.

406. Fourth Argument. Taken from the formal and explicit declarations of the Church. See, for instance, the Encyclical of Gregory XVI. (1832) and of Pius IX. (1846), and the 55th, 77th and 78th condemned propositions of the *Syllabus*, issued by Pius IX. Dec. 8, 1864. But let us hear what Leo XIII. says on this subject. "Political societies cannot, without crime, so conduct themselves as if God did not exist in any manner, or dispense with religion as a foreign and useless institution, or acknowledge one indifferently, viz., regardless of its truth or falsehood, according to their good pleasure. In honoring the Deity, they must strictly follow the rules and method according to which God has declared that He wished to be honored. Rulers of States must, therefore, hold as holy the name of God and place among their principal duties to befriend religion, to foster it

by their benevolence, to protect it with the tutelary authority of the laws and to enact or decide nothing which may be contrary to its integrity."—"Civil society must, by promoting public prosperity, provide for the welfare of the citizens, in such a way as not only to place no obstacles, but to afford every facility to the pursuit and acquirement of that supreme and immutable welfare to which they aspire." Encycl. *Immortale Dei* (1885). "Public power was established for the advantage of those who are governed, and though its proximate end is to lead citizens to prosperity in this terrestrial life, yet it is its peremptory duty, not to lessen but rather to increase for man, the faculty of attaining the supreme and sovereign good which is the eternal felicity of men in the world to come, a task which becomes utterly impossible without religion." Encyclical *Libertas præstantissimum* (1888).

REMARK. We have here set forth, taking the Encyclicals of Leo XIII. as our guide, the Catholic doctrine as to the relations which should exist between the Church and the State. We must not forget that in this demonstration we have treated the question *as an absolute thesis*, making abstraction of *circumstances* which may modify in practice these relations, in the interest of both societies themselves. In treating further on of tolerance, we shall speak of these circumstances, and show w*hen* and *how* a Catholic can swear allegiance to a Constitution, which departs from these general principles, and even defend it, when necessary.

References.—1. See the following standard work, an excellent discussion on this important subject. "L'Encyclique du 8 Décember, 1864, et Les Principes de 1789, or "L'Eglise, L'Etat, et la Liberté." "The Encyclical of December 8, 1864, and the principles of 1789" or "The Church, the State and Liberty," by Emile Keller. Paris, Poussielgue et Fils, 1865.

2. "Popular Errors Concerning Politics and Religion," by Lord Robert Montague, M. P.; London, Burns and Oates, 1874. Chapt. I, II, III.

ART. V.—LIBERALISM AND LIBERTY.

I. General Notions Concerning Liberalism.

407. There exists a doctrine, that is the very negation of the principles which we have demonstrated concerning the relations between Church and State. This doctrine bears, but wrongfully, the name of *Liberalism*, for it is far from being favorable to liberty, properly understood.[1] It is not easy to define Liberalism in a precise and complete manner, for the reason that it is at most a purely negative system, like Protestantism, and like it, it is susceptible of many degrees. I here distinguish three kinds of liberals, a division that includes all the others.

A. There are liberals to whom the name of Radicals is generally given, because, doing away with every religious restraint, they uproot thereby the very foundations of social order. "According to these men," says Leo XIII., "there is not in practical life any divine power which man is

[1] It is important not to confound Liberalism, *as it was* understood during a certain time, with Liberalism *as it is understood today*; for the one differs essentially from the other; the name has been simply retained in order more easily to deceive less observant minds.

In former times by liberalism was understood a political system or rather a political tendency opposed to *centralism* and to *absolutism*, favoring in a great measure, the participation of the citizens in the government of the State, and reserving great autonomy or self-government to individuals, families, private associations, municipalities and provinces, in the management of their several interests. It was, in other words, a tendency favorable to political liberty and to social and individual liberty.

In this ancient sense it is evident that Catholics would be excellent liberals, or rather that they alone would in our day have the right to bear that name. For Catholics are altogether favorable to political and civil liberty such as we describe it further on (nos. 426–428); it is Catholics principally who claim for each person, within the reasonable limit of natural right, the liberty to dispose of his person and his acts, to embrace any kind of life or profession according to his free choice, to form associations for any honest purpose, to dispose of his fortune, during life and at death, according to the promptings of his conscience and without interference on the part of the civil power. Catholics also desire the independence of their country and the liberty to govern itself according to its own laws If they live under a political system that admits modern liberties, they respect that system as suitable to that exceptional state of society; and if they happen to complain, it is when unjust restrictions are imposed upon the liberty of citizens and when the rights held as sacred and inviolable by the Constitution of their country are trampled under foot.

bound to obey, but everyone is a law unto himself. Hence, comes *independent* morality, as it is called, and which under the guise of liberty, frees the will from the fulfillment of the divine precepts, and leads man to unlimited license."

408. REMARKS. 1. Between the Catholic Church and Radical Liberalism, which so allies itself with Naturalism and free-thought as to be quite undistinguishable from them, there evidently exists *an inevitable and complete opposition.* It is not necessary for us to refute it; this has been done when we demonstrated by convincing arguments the existence of a religion revealed by God and the obligation for every man to embrace the Catholic Faith under penalty of missing his last end, which is eternal happiness.

2. This doctrine of Liberalism must necessarily produce *the most disastrous results.* Hear what is said on this subject by the reigning Pontiff: "To make morality depend upon the judgment of human reason alone, is to suppress the essential difference between good and evil; between what is shameful and what is honorable. When such a moral doctrine is admitted, which evidently cannot suffice to repress or control the disordered impulses of the heart, the door is thrown wide open to all the corruptions of licentious life. . . . As soon as the power of God over man and human society is repudiated, it is natural that society should have no religion, and that everything which touches upon religion, should, thenceforward, become an object of most complete indifference. Armed with the idea of its sovereignty, the multitude will be easily led to sedition and to civil disturbances, and the curb of duty and the restraint of conscience being no longer in existence, there will remain nothing but force—powerless when alone—to restrain popular passions. We have the proof of this in the almost daily struggles of civil authority against the *Socialists* and other seditious factions, which have long labored to overthrow the State to its very foundations. Let, then, every man judge and decide for himself, if at all capable of a just appreciation of things, whether such doctrines are conducive to the true liberty and dignity of manhood, or rather destructive of the same."

Encycl. *Libertas præstantissimun* (1888), on "Human Liberty."

B. There is another kind of Liberals, named by Leo XIII. *Government Liberals.* These men do not go so far as to openly deny *all* dependence of man with respect to God; they content themselves with asserting the absolute independence of *all civil society* as such. According to them, the divine laws may rule the life and conduct of individuals, but not those of *States;* in public affairs it is allowable to discard the commands of God and to legislate without taking God's law into account; hence arises, as a necessary consequence, *the separation of Church and State.* This kind of Liberalism may be defined as follows: The doctrine which denies all dependence of civil society upon religion. It may also be called *Social Rationalism.*

Let us enter into a fuller development of this subject. Government or doctrinal Liberalism declares that the nation, as a nation, and all civil powers, of whatever degree in the social hierarchy, are exempt from every obligation, every duty towards religious authority, whatever that be. As far as liberal governments are concerned, Christian Revelation, Jesus Christ its Author, the Church which He founded and which represents Him on earth, are looked upon as *if they did not exist*; they do not know or care to know if Jesus Christ is God; that question does not concern them, it is a matter which they claim belongs exclusively to individuals; at all events the existence of Jesus Christ and of His Church entails no consequences affecting the action of the State and its various powers. Thus, for instance, the legislator, when he enacts laws, the executive powers and the courts when they apply them, need not stop to consider whether these laws are framed in conformity with the law of God, with the expressed will of Jesus Christ, and the rights which He has conferred upon His Church. As to the members of civil society, they are free, say the Liberals, to live as Christians in their capacity of private citizens; but they are *not to act as such when engaged in the performance of their functions as public men.*

If schools are provided by the government, they require that the teaching which they call *neutral* or non-sectarian, should be given without any reference to religion; for, they say, *all opinions must be respected.* As to morality, in order to deceive the simple minded, they speak of independent, non-committal and lay morality, as if there could exist a morality, that is, *a binding rule* of morals, without a supreme lawgiver and a sufficient *sanction*, such as Christ has established, and His Church proclaims viz., eternal reward to the observers of God's law and everlasting punishment to its transgressors. (St. Matth. ch. xxvi, v. 46.) How could such a rule influence the conscience of men when it is stripped of the truths, which alone can supply motives sufficiently strong to induce men to execute it?

409. REMARK. 1. Though government Liberalism is not as openly impious as Radical Liberalism, it contains, nevertheless a doctrine, diametrically opposed to that which we have set forth with respect to the relations that should, in principle, exist between the two powers. We have, therefore, already practically refuted it, grounding our thesis on sound proofs. It follows that a faithful member of the Church cannot entertain any doubt about this subject. (See n. 400–407.) For be it not forgotten, this doctrine of Liberalism is held by its advocates as applicable to all times and to all places. Let us hear the judgment pronounced by Leo XIII. on the point at issue: "That it should be thus, (that is, in order that the State should have no duty to perform towards the Church), it would be necessary that the civil community should have no duty to perform towards God, or that it should be enabled to free itself therefrom with impunity, which is manifestly false. For it cannot be doubted but that the assembling of men in society is the work of God's will, and this is so whether it be considered in its members, in its form, which is authority, in its cause, or in the number and importance of the advantages which it procures for man. It is God who made man for society and united him to his fellow men, in order that the requirements of his nature, for which his single unaided efforts would not suffice, should

find the needed help in association. Hence, civil society, as such, must necessarily acknowledge God as its principle and Author, and consequently render to God's power and authority the social homage and worship due to Him. Neither on the ground of justice, nor on that of reason, the State can ever be atheistic, or what would inevitably lead to atheism, it cannot maintain the same attitude toward all religions whether true or false, nor accord to all indistinctly the same rights." Encycl. *Libertas præstantissimum* (1888).

2. If these government Liberals were logical, they would inevitably *end in radicalism*, and this is what actually happens to those among them who consistently follow their principles to their last conclusions. For, if God has no authority over man as a social being, that is, as a being associated with his fellows in the pursuit of temporal goods, why should God have any authority over him in his private life? Now God, the Creator, is either the absolute Master of man, everywhere and always, or else He is not his master and sovereign in anything whatsoever.

3. We shall see, in what we shall have to say about what are called *modern liberties*, some of the disastrous but inevitable effects of Liberalism in government.

410. **C.** This would be the place to speak of a third kind of Liberalism, which was in vogue during a certain period and which was called Catholic Liberalism or Semi-Liberalism. But this error, which comprised many degrees and many shades, has had its day, and we consider it needless to devote any time to its consideration. Leo XIII. has powerfully contributed to bring back union in the truth and in charity, and this will not be the least of the benefits of his glorious pontificate.[1]

[1] As it generally happens, there have been men who, heartily attached to the Church and wishing to foster her interest, have labored to effect an impossible reconciliation between the doctrines of Liberalism and those of the Church, dreaming that newer and better times had happily arrived for the realization of an absolute reciprocal independence between the two powers, the spiritual and the temporal. They thought that the Church would be acting prudently, if she would keep silent as to the Catholic truths opposed to current errors of the day, and neglect to vindicate those of her rights which are not in harmony with what are called *modern ideas*, and relying only upon

411. REMARK. The principles held by Liberalism must not be confounded with the *Liberal Party*. It is those principles themselves that we are now denouncing. As to the Liberal party, we understand by it, in Catholic countries, the party of men who combine their efforts to make war upon the Church and to fight against her salutary influence. There is one palpable fact, attested by the history of this century; wherever Liberalism becomes predominant there persecution is at once waged against the divine work.

This is exactly the sad spectacle witnessed in our day(1902) in unhappy France, where an infidel government wages an implacable war against religious orders, expelled from their abode in the name of liberty ! We may here exclaim with Madame de Roland when about to be guillotined, O Liberty, how many crimes are committed in thy name!

As long as they fear the number and the zeal of Catholics the Liberals loudly demand liberty in everything and for all. As soon as they consider themselves powerful enough to defy the Catholics, they hasten to exclude them from the benefit of the common right. For Liberalism, the ideal to be realized is the return of old Pagan Cæsarism; it is that the head of the government, one or many, should be the only sovereign ruler, tolerating at its side no spiritual power unless subject to itself and entirely subservient to its interests and *by the monopoly of atheistic schools* holding supreme control over the education of society. In those countries where the law and public conscience do not permit them to realize their ideal, they endeavor to attain it as much as possible by administrative measures, as perfidious as they are bitter and persistent.

There is, however, a difference between the persecution of the present day and that of the past centuries; today it is *universal* and *everywhere the same*, having for its end *the complete destruction* of the only true Church of Jesus Christ.

common right. But truth cannot countenance such compromises. Undoubtedly the Church can and should at certain times, on account of peculiar circumstances of time and place, *tolerate in her* midst the existence of error and evil, but she can never see in such a state of things a *normal* condition, true *progress* and a *definitive* state of society.

This is because the true inspirer and promoter of persecution is Free-Masonry, of which Liberalism is the slave.

To be convinced of the wickedness of the theories here referred to, and of their disastrous consequences, when reduced to practice, we need but recall some of the principles put forward by their advocates. The following will suffice: "Liberalism, if it be anything, is hostility to the Church, or it is nothing." "Liberalism is bound to wage incessant war against the Church, and always uphold her enemies." Liberalism is free thought, or it is nothing." "Nothing can be at the same time liberal in politics, and Catholic in religion." When we recall such abominable maxims, we cannot but approve the justice of the Church's condemnation of liberalism, for it is *false*, *impious* and *disastrous* to society. (1) It is *false*, being contrary to reason, and to the positive, explicit words of Jesus Christ, the Supreme Lawgiver. Reason, as we proved above (nn. 404–407), tells us that civil society must be religious, and consequently that rulers and governments ought to protect the spiritual interests of their subjects and of the Church. Jesus Christ, by imposing the obligation of Baptism on all mankind, evidently wished that all the members of civil society should be *Christian*; and, therefore, kings and princes should do nothing against the Christian religion and its authoritative exponent, the Catholic Church, whom we have proved to be the true Church of Jesus Christ (nn. 328–335). Now the spirit of liberalism contradicts the dictates of reason and the word of Jesus Christ; therefore, liberalism must be *false* in principle.

(2) Moreover, this principle is *impious*, tending, as it does, to destroy religion in the hearts of the people, by upholding the absurd theory that we are at liberty to profess any religion, whether true or false, pagan or Christian.

(3) Lastly, this principle is *disastrous* to society, because a society or nation without religion is a society without morals; without the principles of justice, of order and of virtue. It is a prey to evil passions, to revolutions and all disorders. The Church then, who combats such great evils, is the true protectress of the State and of the rights of the people.

References.—1. "Popular Errors concerning Politics and Religion," by Lord Robert Montagu, M. P.; chapt. I, II, III, VIII, XIII; Burns and Oates, 1874, London, England.

2. "Conversations on Liberalism and the Church," by O. A. Brownson; New York, D. J. Sadlier & Co.

3. "What is Liberalism," edited from the Spanish of Rev. Sarda y Salvany, by Condé B. Pallen; B. Herder, St. Louis, Mo., 1899. A classical work dealing with the subject in an exhaustive, critical style.

4. "Le Liberalisme, la Franc Maconnerie et L' Eglise Catholique" (Liberalism, Free-Masonry and the Catholic Church), by Canon Labis; Bruxelles, V. Devaux, 1869.

5. The Encyclical of Dec. 8, 1864, and the (revolutionary) Principles of 1789, or "The Church, the State and Liberty," quoted above (n. 406).

6. "Abridged Course of Religious Instruction," by Rev. F. X. Schouppe, S. J.; Burns and Oates; p. 90–105.

7. "The Fact Divine," by Rev. Joseph Broeckaert, S. J.; McGowan and Young, Portland, Me.; ch. xiii, xiv. Relations of the two powers.

8. "The Relations of the Church to Society," by Edmund J. O'Reilly, S. J.; J. Hodges, London.

II. Modern Liberties.

412. Liberalism is looked upon as the father and promoter of modern liberties; it boasts of having given them birth, and proclaims them as the grand and immortal conquests of our times. Hence, it has been defined, though incompletely: the system which preaches and favors modern liberties; and again, the doctrine which recognizes and assures equal rights to error and truth, to good and evil. Let us see in the present article what we should think of these liberties in themselves and in their effects, and in the following article what should be our attitude with respect to State Constitution or legislation based upon these liberties.

413. **A.** What is Understood by Modern Liberties? Under this name are generally comprised liberty of con-

science or of worship,[1] liberty of the press, liberty of education, and liberty of association.

Liberty of *conscience* claims to secure to every man the *right* to profess and propagate any religion he may please, or to profess no religion at all. It demands that the *State*, practically atheistic, should not render worship to God; that no religion be privileged, even when the nation by a great majority professes the Catholic Faith. Liberty of the *press* proclaims the *right* to express by the pen, to propagate by writings any doctrine whatsoever on all questions, moral, political, social and religious, no matter how much such teachings may be defiled by impiety or immorality. Liberty of education contends that every man has *the natural right* to propagate these doctrines by means of public teaching, in government institutions and in other ways. Liberty of *association* holds as a natural *right* the faculty of forming any society, even secret (Masonic) and contrary to religion and the moral order. Let us observe that here it is not question of mere *tolerance*, with the view of avoiding greater evils, but of acknowledging what is declared to be *a natural, sacred and inviolable right*. It is true that certain restrictions as to the use of these liberties are devised and admitted; but, besides being *illogical*, these restrictions are no more than *theoretic*. In the sight of the modern State, it is not even an impiety to publicly teach the non-existence of God.[2]

414. B. What should be thought of these Modern Liberties. In the first place, they are false in principle. We have shown that the Catholic Religion is *the only true religion*, and as such binding all men that may come to its knowledge, and that this historical, divine religion is identical with the Roman Catholic Church. As it is *the duty* of every man to save his soul, to attain his last end, this

1 In speaking further on of the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, we shall indicate a distinction, which it is sometime necessary to establish between liberty of conscience and liberty of worship.

2 It goes without saying that here we treat of these three last liberties (of the press, of education and of association), from the religious point of view. As long as dogma and morals are not concerned, Church authority has no occasion to interfere, it would be going out of its sphere to do so.

Church *alone* has, by the will of God, the right to establish herself, to spread herself, and to exact belief and obedience from all men. Every doctrine that combats her doctrinal teachings, every moral system that is opposed to her moral principles, is condemned in advance and without appeal, because it resists dogmatic and moral truth. Religious error and moral evil, which are the poison of the mind and of the will, cannot have the right to impose and propagate themselves among men, who were made to know the truth in matters of religion and morality, as well as in any other subject within their reach. Truth is the natural object of the intellect, as good is the natural object of the will.

Hence, it follows that neither the individual citizen, nor the government can lawfully oppose obstacles to this *exclusive right* of the Catholic Church. For right and duty are two correlative terms; he who admits the *right* in the one, necessarily affirms the *duty* in the others to respect that right. It follows also that no individual or government can acknowledge and concede to error and to evil, to heresy, to impiety, to immorality, *a natural right* to exist and propagate themselves, as such a right does not really belong to them; this, on the contrary, is the exclusive prerogative of truth and virtue.

Therefore, no consistent and loyal Catholic may admit the doctrine that concedes the liberty of error, and places it and truth on the footing of equality before the civil authority, because error has no rights and can never be harmless. Whilst denying all rights to error, we are far from contesting the natural, political or civil and personal rights of those who wittingly or unwittingly personally adhere to it. One thing is to combat false principles, and quite another thing is to assail the individuals, who unfortunately profess them. The Church is always intolerant of false doctrines and erroneous principles, just as she is intolerant of vice, though full of mercy for the men who are its slaves. She follows the example of Almighty God, who hates sin, but receives repenting sinners with bounty and compassion.

Here then is *our thesis*, or our impregnable position, an un-

qualified condemnation of modern liberties. What are they indeed but the proclamation of the rights of error and evil, the denial of the respect and protection due to the exclusive rights of the Catholic Church? This is what results from their very definition, such as we have given before (n. 396).

415. 2. These liberties entail pernicious consequences both on individuals and on society. "The evils of the present day," says Leo XIII., "whose number and gravity we cannot hide from ourselves, come, in great part, from those much vaunted liberties, wherein men thought to find the germs of salvation and glory. This hope has been shattered by facts. In place of sweet and salutary fruits, bitter and poisoned fruits have been produced." Let us indicate briefly some of the disastrous effects resulting from the application of liberal doctrines.

First Effect. The gradual weakening *of faith and religion*, soon followed by their total extinction. It is already difficult for a man, even an educated man, to escape unhurt from the influence of the social environment in which he lives. When that society, in which he moves, offers the spectacle of religious indifference, how difficult it is for him to remain attached, heart and soul, to religion, to constantly practice the duties it enjoins? What will it be when the masses, that is to say, the common people and the illiterate, will see the rulers of the State, the men invested with public power, showing themselves indifferent with regard to the Catholic religion, affecting to make no distinction between religious truth and religious error? They will soon lose all moral sense and look upon religion as a thing of slight or no importance. Even if these examples had not such a deplorable effect upon the people, wicked publications, so largely multiplied and so perfidious in their aim, aided, no doubt, by the so-called neutral, or unsectarian, that is, Godless education, will not fail to destroy insensibly but surely all remnants of faith in their hearts. It is precisely because they count upon this inevitable effect of modern liberties that the Liberals endeavor at times to calm the impatience of those

who would have recourse to open violence and make an end with the Church.

SECOND EFFECT. From the perversion of the mind and contempt of religiou *to perversion of the heart*, there is but an easy step. Why should the man, who has not in his heart the love of God, nor the fear of His justice, nor the prospect of eternal reward, why should he not abandon himself to the violence of his passions? Man longs for happiness; if he seeks it not where it is, in noble submission to God, in purity of conscience and the firm hope of eternal goods, he necessarily seeks it in the criminal gratification of his passions, even the lowest and most brutal. Sad experience here speaks too loudly, and exempts us from insisting any further on this point.

THIRD EFFECT. From the prevalence of those liberties arise the perils that *threaten modern society*. Once freed from the salutary restraint of religion, why should not the poor cast looks of envy on the possessions of the rich, and why, if they be the stronger, should they not seize upon that which excites their covetousness? "Should we be surprised," says Leo XIII., "that men of inferior condition should be enviously desirous of raising themselves as high as those who are the owners of palaces and the possessors of far greater fortune than themselves? Shall we then be surprised if there be no security for public or private life and that mankind has almost arrived at the extreme stage of its existence?" It is to this desperate stage that the doctrine of Liberalism inevitably leads. In all this the Anarchists of all countries only drive liberal principles to their ultimate consequences. Assuredly many men who profess these doctrines and who preach them to the people do not see the disastrous consequences, to which they finally lead. But their lack of foresight does not destroy the logic of facts. Logic is, indeed, merciless in its ultimate results. Sooner or later the socialistic maxims bear their fruits and are transformed into open acts of violence, that is, into general disorder and revolution.[1]

[1] "When they have once lost all belief in an endless existence to come, where each one shall receive either reward or punishment, according to his deeds, the populace, terribly logical in their conclusions, will

416. Objection. There exists a specious objection, to which it is important to reply. It is this: God, the supreme lawgiver, has granted liberty to man; society or civil power can, therefore, do the same thing, and consequently grant full liberty to its citizens.

417. Answer. 1. To answer this difficulty, it is sufficient to call to mind the *essential distinction* between physical liberty or *natural power* to do a thing, and moral liberty or the *right* to do it. God, say you, has given liberty to man. That is true, but what is this liberty? *Physical* liberty, that is to say, the ability to choose between good and evil, has, indeed, been bestowed upon all human individuals, but far from intending that man should use it to do evil, God has, on the contrary, *imposed on him the moral* obligation to use it in the attainment of his last end, by doing good. This is so true, that God threatens to inflict the punishment of hell on the man who will abuse his liberty by choosing evil; and he retains the right *to punish him eternally*. Whether civil society wills it or not, it cannot deprive man of physical liberty; but it would not be imitating God if society claimed to grant him the right to do evil *with impunity*.

2. To be able *legitimately* to imitate any one, a person must be in an analogous situation with him whom he takes as his model. Now, from the point of view of liberty, there are many *important differences* between the divine and the human government.

a. "God is judge," says St. Thomas, "because He is the Creator," and in Him the judicial act and the creative act

necessarily and consistently demand complete equality in this, and they will demand it with irresistible determination, grinding their teeth with rage, with hatred in their heart, and murderous weapons in their hands. They will say: "My soul is, after all, only an ephemeral being, destined sooner or later to annihilation; and God is only an hypothetical existence. You, leaders of public opinion, by your writings and public utterances, have delivered us from the uncomfortable fear of hell, and have stripped us of the sweet hope of heaven. Well, fear of punishment and hope of heaven being done away with, there remains for us nothing but the earth. We demand it, and we shall have it." (Mgr. Mermillod. See further on in chapter v, article on popular education, similar quotations from V. Hugo and J. J. Rousseau).

touch each other throughout the insignificant duration of time. When one has eternity at his disposal, as God has, why hasten to do justice? Is human government in the same conditions?

As St. Augustine tells us, God is patient because He is eternal. He can afford to tolerate in the brief space of time sins that are to be inevitably punished in eternity, if not repented before death.

b. Whilst awaiting the supreme and inevitable reparation, God has placed, *during this life*, side by side with physical liberty, all the necessary restraints or *correctives*, such as commands, exhortations, promises, threats, interior graces, etc., which *protect* the liberty of the good and restrict that of the wicked.

There is no better exposition of man's relation to God, his Creator and supreme Judge, than that which the Lord Himself has revealed to us in the book of Ecclesiasticus, ch. xv, vv. 14-18: "God made man from the beginning, and left him in the hand of his own counsel. (Behold here the gift of *physical* liberty.) He added His commandments and precepts. (Behold here the moral law restraining man's free will within the proper bounds.) If thou wilt keep the commandments, and perform acceptable fidelity forever, they shall preserve thee. He hath set water and fire before thee; stretch forth thy hand to which thou wilt. Before man is life and death, good and evil; that which he shall choose shall be given him."

Moreover, God has created domestic society and civil society, and He has invested both of them with the right of punishment. To fathers He even gives the command to punish their children and not to spare the rod (Prov. xiii, v. 24, and xxii, v. 15), and St. Paul in his letter to the Romans (xiii, 3-4) states in the clearest terms the right and power, with which civil rulers have been divinely invested, of punishing their rebellious and criminal subjects. "Rulers are not a terror to the good work, but to the evil. . . . For he (the Ruler) beareth not the sword in vain. For he is the minister of God, an avenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil."

418. REMARK. From what precedes, it clearly follows that it is indeed very wrong to accuse of intolerance or tyranny either the Church or the State, when, as in the middle ages, they endeavored to regulate the legitimate exercise of the human will, to restrain it within proper bounds, to diminish to their subjects the opportunities of doing evil and rushing into calamities and ruin. These just restrictions upon the liberty of doing ill, far from being an act of *violence*, are, on the contrary, a great benefit granted to society, for they render the fulfillment of their duties more easy to its members, and their violation more difficult. This benefit is secured to them by the close alliance of Church and State, when such union is made possible by circumstances. Hence, in protecting the Church of Jesus Christ, and in forbidding other kinds of worship contrary to it, the State does not do violence to the liberty of man, but it helps him *in his weakness*, preventing him from straying from the right path. It would be evidently absurd to claim that it is trespassing on the rights of the human *intelligence* to enlighten it so as to prevent it from taking the false for the true; why then should it be less absurd to pretend that it is tyranny, that it is doing violence to the will of man, to remove the opportunities that lead it to evil, and to aid it to attain its proper object which is good? As well say that the parapet of a bridge is an obstacle in the free passage of travelers. As well say that a father of a family abuses the rights of his children in preventing immoral or impious doctrines from infecting their innocent and candid souls and in forbidding everything that might corrupt them! Moreover, to repeat it once more, man can never have the right to be a blasphemer, to be impious or vicious, and the State does not *violate any right* of its subjects in preventing them from destroying in their fellow citizens the beliefs necessary for eternal salvation and from sapping the foundations of morality, which constitutes the basis of civil as well as religious society.

Let us add that it is strange to see these sophists admit on the one hand that it is not infringing upon liberty to forbid and punish certain crimes, as murder, theft, incendiarism, which may be hurtful to their temporal welfare, and on the

other cry out against tyranny, because, foresooth, authority removes causes of disasters much more fatal, as they endanger the attainment of their *eternal happiness*.

III. Tolerance.

419. Must we conclude, from what we have said, that a true Catholic should never accept and defend a political Constitution, which admits modern liberties? Far from it. Listen to what Leo XIII. says on this subject:

"In her maternal appreciation, the Church takes into account the overwhelming weight of human infirmity, and she does not ignore the movement, which in our day carries away minds and things. For these motives, though she grants *rights* only to that which is true and honest, she does not, however, raise opposition to that *tolerance* which civil rulers are allowing with respect to certain things contrary to truth and justice; and this she does with the view of hindering greater evil, or of obtaining or preserving some considerable good. In other words, if the Church necessarily condemns, as a matter of *principle*, those false or noxious liberties, she acknowledges at the same time that there are *circumstances* in which these liberties (n. 413) may be licitly tolerated." To speak of tolerance always supposes an evil thing, but which is borne with and permitted for grave motives. "If the Church," again says the same Pontiff, "judges that it is not permissible to place the various forms of worship on the same footing as the true religion, she does not thereby condemn the rulers of States, who, in view of a good purpose to be attained or of an evil to be avoided, tolerate in practice that these various forms of worship should, each of them, have its place in the State."

Undoubtedly a loyal son of the Church cannot admit that man possesses the natural right to profess any religion whatsoever, to spread error and evil by means of the press or by teaching. Modern liberties are, therefore, in themselves bad and worthy of condemnation; that is the *thesis*. However, there are circumstances of time and country, which permit through conscientious motives to tolerate them,

to uphold them, to adopt them, to defend them, because by so doing greater evils are avoided; this is the *hypothesis*, or supposition.[1]

We shall now point out some of the reasons which justify the lawfulness of toleration in the circumstances mentioned above.

420. 1. *The interest itself of the Church* and of her divine mission may require this toleration. It is an assured principle that, of two evils, we should choose the less, and that an evil may be legitimately tolerated in order to avoid a greater one. But, in a given country and circumstances, where the modern liberties laid down in the national Constitution have passed into facts and practice, the interest of truth and religion may require that such a state of things should be allowed to continue, at least for a time, in order to avoid a greater evil. In this supposition any attempt to abolish these liberties already established, would not serve the best interests of the Church, but would rather arouse against her hatred and reprisals, and expose the State to deplorable discussions and discords.

2 Moreover, *this is the teaching of sound theology*, according to the doctrine of St. Thomas; in certain cases the toleration even of heathen worship may be recognized as legitimate. With greater reason then may the toleration of modern liberties be held as lawful, because even the most flagrant abuse of these liberties does not, like paganism, go as far as to deify the creature and even to deify vice itself.

---

[1] This distinction between the *thesis* and the *hypothesis* is met with in a multitude of occasions in practical life, and common sense imposes it often, even when we do not realize its necessity. The hypothesis is the application of the principles of the thesis within the limits of right and justice. Thus, to correct a misbehaving child is the duty of a parent; that is the thesis; to correct the child at a given moment or in a given way, may be an act of imprudence; this is the hypothesis. Food is necessary to support animal life; this is the thesis; but the same food might be injurious to a sick man; this is the hypothesis. It is the same as to religious truth. Truth possesses rights that are inviolable and exclusive; but circumstances may require that the exact, rigorous exercise of these rights should not be insisted on and that toleration should be granted to error or to evil, in order to avoid greater calamities in social life.

421. 3. *The conduct of the Church* proves the lawfulness of this toleration. If toleration of modern liberties were never to be allowed, the Church should have obliged Constantine, on the very day of his conversion, to suppress within his Empire every form of pagan worship. In the case of the return to the Faith of a Protestant ruler she should also require on his part the immediate exclusion of all Protestant forms of worship.

The Church has never acted in this manner, and it is not at all in this sense that Gregory XVI. in the Encyclical *Mirari vos*, 1832, and Pius IX. in the Encyclical *Quanta cura*, have condemned these liberties.

We find in the "Roman Review," the *Civiltā Cattolica*, a page, written in 1868, that summarizes very clearly the doctrine which we have just set forth:

"With the exception of a very small number of unreflecting minds, all sincere Catholics hold that the liberty of worship is *absurd as a principle*. Is it not as monstrous from the social as well as from the individual point of view, to put truth and error on the same footing, and to accord to them the same rights? Catholics, therefore, hold that such a principle, applied to the political body, cannot, by its nature, be otherwise than harmful. However, they also admit that in certain cases we must know how to bear with this evil, because there are circumstances, in which, owing to the ill-will of the subject, unity in religion cannot be imposed upon him without resorting to violence, a thing altogether adverse to Catholic principles. It would be killing the sick to apply to them the treatment suitable to healthy people. But who can, unless insane, pretend that the treatment adopted for the sick is the ideal system of hygiene, and that everybody should be subjected to it? It is impossible to govern, otherwise than with freedom of worship properly understood, a people among whom religious unity does not exist, and who are socially divided by diversity of worship. But to represent this state of things as a state of social perfection, to pretend that it should be introduced in places, where its introduction is not required by imperious necessity, would be as

absurd as to say that medicine is the true food of man, or that nothing is more conducive to preserving purity of morals in a family than to open wide the doors to all kinds of perverted and corrupt people."

422. COROLLARIES. What we have said above gives the answer to many seeming difficulties.

1. We see that there is no incompatibility between the duties of a good *Catholic* and those of a good *citizen*, in a country where modern liberties are proclaimed in the Constitution of the State. This pretended incompatibility between religious and civil duties is manifestly implied in the motto devised by the advocates of Liberalism and its modern liberalistic doctrines. "Our policy," they say, "is to be Catholic with the Pope and Liberal with the Government." It is easy to perceive that this motto involves contradictory characters, which cannot coexist in the same subject. If Papal Catholicism is the truth, and we have proved it to be such, its contradictory, Liberalism, must be false. In fact, he that is Catholic with the Pope, holds with him those principles, which should regulate civil Governments, such as truth, justice, morality, order, etc. He that professes with the Government any right, just, true, moral and wholesome principles, professes them together with the Pope. Hence we fail to see how the fulfillment of these two duties to the Sovereign Pontiff on one hand, and to civil authority on the other, can be said to be utterly irreconcilable. But if the words "Liberal with the Government," imply a profession of such Liberalism as we described above (n. 407 et seqq), which the Pope cannot hold, and which is therefore inconsistent with Catholicism, then we admit that these two conditions or characters are absolutely incompatible, viz., adherence to the teachings of the Vicar of Christ and submission to the behests of Liberalism.

2. It is in this way that we can account for the *difference of conduct* of the Church in different countries as to what relates to liberty granted to dissenting sects. In a state where the Church enjoys all her rights it would be prejudicial to the success of her divine mission to yield a place to error

and evil. Hence, she cannot, without failing in her duty, permit such an innovation. On the contrary, in a country where the true religion is oppressed, where liberty exists only for those who attack and harass her, it is easily understood that the Church should accept civil toleration, that is, the introduction of an exceptional order of things, she being satisfied with retaining at least a part of her rights.

3. It can easily be seen why, under a political Constitution securing liberty of worship to all, the Church *should energetically claim*, as she does, her share of liberty under the Constitution. It would be ridiculous to say that in doing this, the Church abandons her own principles or that she abdicates thereby her rights. She acts simply as a proprietor, who by the triumph of Socialism, sees himself despoiled of his possessions, and afterwards, by virtue of the very principles of Socialism, would claim his share of the common mass of goods. Evidently such proprietor would not, in doing this, be renouncing his own principles, but he would simply be adopting a legitimate means of recovering at least a portion of his own fortune unjustly taken from him, and he would do so by invoking, as an argument *ad hominem*, the communistic principle itself, which claims that earthly goods should be equally divided among men.

423. Remarks. 1. Care must be taken not to confound *practical* toleration, of which we have just spoken, with *dogmatic* toleration which reduces itself to *theoretical* indifference. Dogmatic tolerance is essentially wrong and formally condemned by the Church. (Encycl. *Mirari vos* and *Quanta cura*, quoted above n. 421.) It is, indeed, downright impiety for the State to show itself indifferent as to all forms of worship, when it so acts, not because of the special difficulties of the times and in the interest of the Church herself, but because *it believes and professes* that all religions are equally indifferent or equally good.

2. Though civil toleration is licit under the circumstances indicated, the *things thus tolerated* by modern Constitutions do not thereby cease to be reprehensible in themselves, before God and before the individual conscience. If, because

of the liberty of the press, the civil power permits the publication of the most frightful blasphemies and the sale and circulation of immoral books, these outrages against the Divinity and against good morals are, from the point of view of conscience, none the less horrible crimes. It is the same as to all actions intrinsically bad, which legislators may sometimes tolerate for very serious reasons, but those who commit them are none the less condemned by the Divine Legislator, who will not fail to punish them in His own time.

3. The Church cannot permit that it should be proclaimed, as a general and absolute principle, that the liberty granted to heterodox sects, for the propagation of errors and evil, is what is best and most conformable to the nature of man and true civilization. She cannot admit that liberty granted to everything that causes the loss of souls is good or honest in itself, nor recognize in this liberty the evidence of a progressive society. Hence, Pius IX. has condemned the following proposition: "The best condition of political society demands in our times that every State be constituted and governed without any thought as to religion, as if it did not exist, or at least without making any difference between the true religion and false one." (Encycl. *Quanta cura*, and Syll. Prop. 77, 78, 79, 80.)

Every true Catholic, therefore, will be on his guard against asserting that freedom of worship *is the best condition of things, absolutely speaking*; he will not say that civil toleration is the result of *a natural, sacred and inviolable right* for those who are in the possession of this liberty. He will, on the contrary, frankly proclaim the true principles, the exclusive rights of the truth and of the Church of Jesus Christ. Whilst admitting the present abnormal conditions of his country he will, nevertheless, deplore the state of things made necessary by those conditions, and the blindness of some people who look upon the adoption of modern liberties as the sure guarantee of a prosperous government. He will neglect nothing that may *peacefully* improve the situation, *making use of all legal means* recognized as legitimate by the Consti-

tution itself. By spreading around him the whole truth by word of mouth and by writings, he will endeavor to make possible, by the return of erring minds to the profession of true principles, the full observance of the laws of Christian society, an earnest of prosperity to the State as well as to the Church.

4. To remove misconceptions we here reproduce a decision of the Roman Congregation of the Holy Office, issued August 29, 1877. It is as follows:

"The Church by condemning Liberalism does not intend to condemn the several political parties, which happen to call themselves *Liberals*, as her decisions refer exclusively to errors opposed to Catholic doctrine." (n. 407, note 1.)

5. As the Catholic principle regarding civil tolerance, which we have advocated above (n. 423), must in practice admit of modifications relative to the exercise of religious worship, for the reasons alleged above (n. 419), the following rules should be borne in mind:

(a) When a country is in possession of the Truth, that is to say, when it is Catholic, the laws also must be Catholic in their spirit, and tend to the defense of truth against error.

(b) In a country, where there are several religious forms of worship, but where the Catholic Religion predominates, the latter must be the favored one. Hence false worships may be simply tolerated so long as they remain inoffensive, and are not aggressive.

(c) In a country where there are many religions, and where no one predominates, the law may extend equal protection to all, so long as those who profess them do not disturb the public peace.

(d) In a country, where many religions exist, and where error predominates, the law cannot prohibit or restrict Catholic truth, under the pretext that it is dangerous to the State; for such could never be the case, seeing that Catholicism is shown to be a divine institution, highly beneficial to both the State and to its citizens.

(e) In countries entirely infidel, heretical, schismatical,

or pagan, the civil authority has no right to hinder the introduction or propagation of Catholic Faith so long as this is done by means of persuasion, viz., by instructing the people in the tenets of Catholic doctrine, and exhibiting to them the evidences and arguments in favor of its divine truth.

(f) Lastly persecution cannot be lawful in favor of either truth or error. We mean persecution properly so called, that is to say, violence employed against an unoffending religion whether it be true or false. ("Religious Instruction," by Fr. Shouppe, S. J.)

IV. A Few Considerations Concerning Liberty and Its Different Kinds.

424. It seems to us expedient to add here a few considerations concerning liberty, because there are few questions around which want of reflection or bad faith has accumulated more errors and dangerous sophisms. "If in the discussions which are carried on concerning liberty," says Leo XIII. in the Encyclical *Libertas præstantissimum* (June 20, 1888), "were understood that legitimate and proper liberty as reason and our words have described it, no one could cast up any more against the Church the reproach made against her with supreme injustice, namely, that she is the enemy of the liberty of States. The attitude of the Church regarding this excellent gift that God granted to man, has always been such as to deserve the gratitude of mankind. And yet there are many who persist in believing that the Church is the enemy of human liberty. The cause of this misconception is the imperfect and wrong idea of liberty which some people form. For, through the very alteration of the true idea of liberty, or through the unwarrantable extension attributed to its scope, it is applied to many things in which man, according to the judgment of sound reason, cannot be free."

How many men, indeed, confound true liberty with a chimerical and criminal independence or downright license?[1]

1 To be independent means to owe nothing to anyone, and consequently, to have received nothing and to stand in need of nothing

How many others see in the base physical power, which they possess to do evil, the *right* to do it! If man really held *from his nature the right* to write everything, to teach everything, to do everything that pleased him, it is evident that *modern liberties* would be completely lawful in themselves.

Hence we see that where liberty is concerned it is of the greatest importance to make clear and full distinctions. We shall endeavor to say enough to warn our readers against sophisms so dangerous in this matter.

In general the word liberty implies freedom from constraint. But as there are constraints of various kinds, so there are many kinds of liberty. Physical or *psychological* liberty is one thing, *moral* liberty is quite another; nor can *political* liberty be confounded with *civil* or *social* liberty; and when man speaks of *modern liberties*, they again attach a different sense to the word liberty.

425. 1. Physical or *psychological* liberty, which is also called liberty of indifference, liberty of choice, *free-will*, consists in this, that when all the conditions necessary for action are present, one will retain the (physical) faculty or power of acting or not acting, of determining itself to choose one thing or another. Hence, the essence of liberty is the right to determine or to choose by oneself, and not at all the right to choose evil. In fact, God is infinitely free, and yet He cannot will anything but what is good; but He freely chooses between the various forms and the various degrees of good whichever He wishes to realize outside of Himself

---

from anyone whomsoever. This absolute independence belongs and can only belong to God, because He alone possesses in Himself the reason of His existence and of all His perfections, for He is Himself His own end, and the source of His infinite felicity. Man, on the contrary, receives from God his existence, his faculties and everything that serves to develop them and to exercise them. If God ceased for one moment to preserve him from the abyss of nothingness he would at once be precipitated into it. It follows that man depends completely and at every moment upon the Creator; he is dependent *by essence*, because it is of his essence to be a creature. He is much more so, were it possible, in the order of grace and glory, to which divine bounty has raised him. Hence, our Savior's words to His disciples "Without me you can do nothing" (John, xv, 5), are perfectly true both in the natural and supernatural Order.

in the created order. The Saints in heaven are also free, and yet evil has become impossible for them; enlightened as they are by the full light of truth and possessing the Infinite Good, how could they have the slightest thought or the slightest desire to renounce this perfect happiness?

See "Manual of Catholic Theology," New York, the Catholic Publication Society, 1899, vol. 1. "The Absolute Freedom and Moral Perfection of God's Will," p. 230–246.

See Mazzella (Cardinal) "De Deo creante," p. 814, n. 1217, where he very ably treats the question of the Confirmation of the Saints in grace, and proves that the just in heaven are intrinsically impeccable, though perfectly free.[1]

That man possesses free will is an undeniable fact, proven as it is by the analysis of our free acts, by our own inner sense and by the testimony of all mankind. Moreover, to deny free will in man would be to overthrow the foundation of all morality and destroy society itself (n. 342).[2]

1 The possibility of doing evil is a veritable imperfection, a weakness, a want of power in the human will here on earth. Surely no man would boast of having the *power* of being ill; but he would rather say that he was unfortunately without the power of enjoying perfect health. With regard to the intellect, no man will see a sign of mental strength in the possibility of reasoning erroneously and drawing false conclusions from the true principles.

To illustrate this thought by some examples drawn from the physical order, who would be so silly as to pride himself on the power of being able to draw *crooked* instead of straight lines? In this connection let me relate here the often quoted story of the O of Giotto, the famous Florentine Painter (d. 1336). The Pope, anxious to secure his services, sent a messenger to ask the painter for a specimen of his art. Giotto, who was very courteous, took a sheet of paper and a pencil dipped in red color; then, resting his elbow on his side, to form a sort of compass, with one turn of his hand he drew a circle so perfect and exact that it was a marvel to behold, and handed this to the courtier as a sufficient proof of his technical skill. Hence, the origin of the Italian phrase "As round as Giotto's O."

What should we think of a painter or a draughtsman boasting of his abilty to draw crooked circles? A similar judgment should be passed on those, who are proud of possessing the power of straying from the path of right and justice in exercise of their free will.

Let us then be consistent, and apply the same language to the liberty of man; we must say that the power to choose *evil* and violate the moral law, that is to say, the power to wander away from our last end, far from being a true power, a perfection, is on the contrary an imperfection, laid upon our will power as long as we are on earth in this time of *trial* of the present life.

2 There have been philosophers called fatalists (fatalism naturally flows from materialism), who have ventured to deny the existence of

The reader will find a complete demonstration of human liberty in the second chapter of the introduction to this work, from n. 55 to n. 93 inclusive, to which he is referred.

Physical violence undoubtedly can prevent our *exterior actions*, but it has no power over the act of our will. "Our bodies are in your power," the martyrs were wont to say to their persecutors, "but you can do nothing to our souls." It is known that the Church has always maintained this free-will against all contrary denials of it.

This truth is forcibly brought out by our Blessed Redeemer in those striking words of His Gospel (Luke xii, 4-5): "I say to you, my friends, be not afraid of them, that kill the body, and after that have no more that they can do. But I will show you whom you shall fear; fear ye Him, who after He hath killed, hath power to cast into hell. Yea, I say to you fear Him." Hence, the persecuting tyrant may starve, may wound and kill the body, but the soul, its liberty, its existence is entirely beyond his reach.

426. 2. Man is in possession of *moral* liberty, when with respect to an action, no obligation is imposed *upon his will* to perform these actions or to omit them. *Moral* obligation consists in the necessity for man to conform his actions to the rules of morality, under pain of straying from his last end.

Man is physically free, as we have said, but does he also

free will. But this negation does not and cannot exist elsewhere than on their lips. Repudiated by the whole human race, it is contradicted by the actions, the words and the writings of these same philosophers. Every tongue which pronounces the words virtue and vice, merit and demerit, praise and blame, reward and punishment, conscience and remorse, every enjoined command, every promulgated law, every advice asked for, every repentance expressed, every punishment inflicted, all these proclaim human liberty and show what is the true sentiment of the common people as well as that of the learned. Free agents alone can be led by commands or threatened with chastisement. Where can we find a man who does not act in one way with irresponsible children, the insane and others of like condition, and in quite a different manner with men in full possession of their reason? Who does not perfectly well understand that there is a great difference in the restraint or confinement applied to a criminal and that applied to an insane person? Whence this difference if not from free-will? It is free will alone which in our eyes makes the former a guilty man while the disorders committed by the other are attributed only to his misfortune.

enjoy absolute moral liberty? Is there no obligation imposed upon the human will? Have we always the right to do those things which we can do through our natural powers? No man of sense would venture to maintain such a proposition. (416 b.)

It is manifest, then, that *we cannot legitimately do*, that is without failing in a duty of conscience, all that we are capable of doing through our natural faculties. A son, for instance, has the *power* of plunging a dagger into the heart of his father; who would dare say he has the *right* to do so? There is, therefore, an essential difference between physical power and moral right. If this difference did not exist, we should have to admit the innocence of the most atrocious parricide; we should have to admit that the brigand, who conceals himself in an ambush ready to attack the traveler on the highway, has the right to assassinate his victim, because he has the power to do so.[1] The foundation of the moral law or the obligation, which imposes itself upon the human will, is the will of God, the Creator, the Sovereign

[1] Liberalism always confounds *Psychological liberty or free-will* with moral liberty. It is precisely because of this confusion of thought that Liberalism attributes to man *the natural right* to propagate error and evil and that it considers modern liberties as a thing *absolutely and intrinsically good*. Man is free, says the Liberal doctrine; this liberty is a right of his nature; hence the State must respect this liberty and cause it to be respected. Man is physically free, nay, so free that no one, not even the State, can interfere with the inner action of his will, granted; but is he also *morally* free? Has he the right to abuse his liberty, and to propagate evil? If you maintain that man has such rights, then we ask you why does the State enact laws, establish tribunals, and build prisons? Can it punish the exercise of a right? Is it lawful for the State to punish what it holds to be the legitimate right of citizens?

It is well, also, to remark the ambiguity that exists in the French verb *pouvoir* "I can," for it is the double meaning of the words, which leads astray many minds and gives birth to many sophisms regarding liberty.

Here we have a practical application of the essential difference between the verbs may and can. I *may* not be allowed, on moral and legal grounds, to do what I *can* do by my physical power or strength. In other words, *physical* liberty is freedom from violence or physical coercion; *moral* liberty is the absence of any prohibition from legitimate authority. We are all *physically* free to violate the laws of the country, at least as long as we are not held in duress, but we are not free to do so *morally*, for we cannot transgress those laws without committing a wrong.

Master of man and the Supreme Lawgiver. The atheist alone can proclaim the entire independence of man from the moral point of view; but can he prove that he is right in thinking so?

The essence or intimate nature of man's liberty consists in complete immunity from any impediments, that may hinder him from tending to his last end, which is to do God's will by pursuing the path of rectitude, and thus securing his true happiness here and hereafter. Hence, the greater is his control over inordinate tendencies and unruly passions, which are obstacles to the attainment of his end, and the greater is the liberty he enjoys. And, on the contrary, whenever man fails to curb his irregular inclinations, dragging him to evil, he becomes their slave by yielding to their behests, instead of domineering over them. Thus the intemperate become the slaves of drink; the voluptuous the slaves of lust, the vindictive the slaves of anger, the misers the slaves of covetousness. All this is manifestly implied in our Savior's words, "Whosoever committeth sin is the servant of sin" (John viii, 34). Hence, we easily understand why the Holy Ghost bestows so high a eulogy on him, who holds his passions within the bounds of reason and the injunctions of Divine Faith. "The patient man is better than the valiant, and he that ruleth his spirit than he that taketh cities" (Prov. xvi, 32). As true liberty is freedom from every thing that is wrong, or leads to wrong, such as error and sin, hence, our Bl. Savior said in his Gospel (John viii, 32), "You shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." This salutary thought is clearly conveyed by the Apostle St. Paul, when he tells us that, "Where the spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty" (II Corinth. iii, 17).

A clear conception of man's liberty is evidently contained in those words of St. Paul (I Corinth., vii, 37), "He that hath determined, being steadfast to his heart, having no necessity, but having power of his own will." No one can question the importance of the doctrine of the freedom of the will. For if man be free, then he is accountable for his actions: be they good or evil, they are *his*; praise or blame, re-

ward or punishment, which follow in their wake, are deserved and inevitably administered by the Supreme Judge, who will give to each according to his work, and from whose sentence there lies no appeal.

It is, therefore, absolutely wrong to say: Man is free, therefore he cannot be subject to any authority. The contrary is the truth. Man is free, therefore he is responsible for his acts and susceptible of obligations; he is free, but he is bound to make *legitimate use* of his freedom; he is free, but he should submit himself to God and to every power emanating from God. To pretend to free oneself from the necessary dominion of God over His creature, is insanity as well as ingratitude and a crime. On the contrary, for a man to practically recognize, in his moral life, private and public, his entire dependence upon Him, who is at the same time infinite Wisdom, boundless Bounty and the Supreme Good, this is the glory and happiness of man, as it is also his most imperative duty. (297.)

"True and desirable liberty in the individual order," says Leo XIII., "is that which does not leave man as a slave to error, or to passion, which are his worst enemies." "In a society of men, liberty worthy of the name does not consist in doing as we may please, but in being able, with the help of civil laws, to live more easily in accord with the prescriptions of the eternal law." (Encycl. *Libertas Præstantissimum.*) It is in the same sense that Montesquieu (d. 1755) expresses himself: "Liberty can consist only in doing that which *we should* will." Unhappily "there is a great number of men, who, following the example of Lucifer, the author of the criminal cry: *I will not serve*, understand by the word liberty that which is simply nothing but pure and absurd license." Such are the men who belong to that school, so widely spread and so powerful, who, borrowing their name from that of liberty, wish to be called *Liberals.*" (Encycl. *Libertas Præstantissimum*). It is indeed evident that to act against the light of reason and Faith is to turn away from man's last end, to prepare one's own degradation and unhappiness; it is not using liberty, it is *abusing* it. That

which shows the nobility of our being, is the power, with which our will is endowed, to choose the means enabling us to reach the final goal, in other words, *the power to do freely what is right* and, therefore, good.

427. 3. Political liberty is twofold. **a.** Applied to a nation, it consists in its independence in regard to other nations. It is manifest that the Church approves of this independence, because everywhere she inculcates upon her children the duty of showing efficaciously their love for their country, and when necessity requires it, risking their lives to defend it against its enemies.

b. If applied to each *individual citizen*, it consists in the participation in a greater or less degree, directly or indirectly (through the right to vote), in the government of one's country. This political liberty naturally differs according to the form of government; evidently it is not the same in an absolute monarchy, or in a monarchy tempered by the aristocratic element, as in a constitutional monarchy or a republic.

Provided the sacred rights of religion be respected, the Church is indifferent concerning these several forms of government. She accommodates herself to all, because she can save souls as easily in the republic of Ecuador under Garcia Moreno as in a Christian monarchy. Consequently, provided a legitimate government allows the Church freely to accomplish her mission, without encroaching upon any of her rights, she will in no way prevent it from following its own mission, which is to secure the temporal welfare of the people.

428. 4. *Social* or *civil* liberty, which is also called individual liberty, may be defined; the faculty for each citizen to exercise, within the limits of right, his personal activity, to provide for his private interests and those of his family, without hindrance on the part of his fellow-citizens or of the government. It comprises the liberty of the person, of action, property, family, of the municipality, the right to fulfill the duties of charity, to found associations for some worthy purpose, etc.

Undoubtedly political liberty is a good and desirable thing,

but the so-called Liberals of our day, whose tendency, when in power, is to arrive at *universal centralization*, to invade the most sacred rights of individuals, families, particular societies, endeavor to make people believe that true liberty resides for individuals in the exercise of electoral rights. But in reality, what benefit is it to me to enjoy, to a certain extent, political liberty, that is, to have by my vote a hundredth or a thousandth part of influence in the exercise of public authority, if the government, which I may have helped to establish, does, by its tyrannical laws and merciless bureaucracy, interfere in countless ways with my activity, pretends to regulate capriciously my own individual acts, and shackles my freedom and my very life by the slavery of endless bureaucratic details?

The history of the present century, in which everyone is ever speaking of liberty, shows most clearly that oppression of true liberty and particularly of the liberty of *Catholic consciences* is the dream of all those who labor to overthrow the Church, in order to erect on her ruins a society purely naturalistic, without God, and, therefore, without Faith, without Hope, without Love, and without any expectation of future life.

Facts the most striking attest how the Church has always been favorable to civil liberty. Who, indeed, has laid throughout the world the foundations of true liberty and true equality, if not the Church? Is it not the Church, that amidst the frightful perversions of ideas and of morals, of both ancient and modern paganism, has successfully recalled to men the Christian principle that they are brethren, all equal before God? Is it not the Church that has imposed upon the governed, as well as the governing classes, the rigorous duty of justice and charity? Is it not the Church that, by her teaching and institutions, has secured the rehabilitation of woman, of the child, of the slave, of the poor, of the laborer, in a word, of all the unfortunates, whose rights have been flagrantly usurped in a thousand ways, and trampeled upon for centuries?

References.—1. "Our Christian Heritage," by Cardinal Gibbons; ch. xxiv et seqq.

2. "What is Liberalism?" Adapted from the Spanish of Sarda y Salvany, by Condé B. Pallen.

3. "Points of History," ch. vi; "Religious Toleration, a Question of First Principles."

4. "Popular Errors Concerning Politics and Religion," by Lord Robert Montagu, M. P.; ch. vii, viii, xiii, xv.

5. "Liberalism and the Church," by O. A. Brownson.

CHAPTER IV.

Of Certain Accusations Brought Against the Catholic Church.

429. Holy in her Founder, always pure in her doctrine and in her morality, the Church has never ceased to lead her members to the practice of the most beautiful and heroic virtues. Hence, in spite of human frailty and the violence of the passions, there always has been among Catholics a countless number of saints, apostles, martyrs, men of grand and noble character, incapable of baseness, ever ready to devote themselves to works of the highest perfection and most sublime charity.

But if man can and should make an honest use of his liberty, and carry on a courageous warfare against his vicious tendencies, it unfortunately happens but too often that he listens to their insidious voice. The grace of holy baptism, and even that of the priesthood, does not destroy in his heart the tendencies which incline to evil.

Should we, therefore, be surprised, if in the course of nineteen hundred years, we sometimes meet with faults or crimes committed by Catholics, or even by priests and bishops, forgetful of their duties?

In presence of these inevitable failings of our human nature what is the conduct of the enemies of Catholicism? In place of admiring the prodigies of virtue, performed through supernatural grace, by a multitude of souls, despite of the sway of rebellious passions, they gather together with zealous care a few abuses and faults, which are met with in the long series of past centuries, and out of this material they manufacture their weapons for attacking the Church; they cast up

these charges unceasingly in the face of the Church, as if she were responsible for them. The world, regenerated by the Church, counts for nothing in their eyes, no more than the reprobation with which she has always rebuked and condemned everything contrary to the divine law; the crimes of a few baptized scoundrels form the great arsenal of the seekers after scandal. They are always compelled to return to the use of the same weapons, however blunted they may be. In season and out of season, they are always talking of the Inquisition, the persecution of Galileo, and of a few other facts. To forewarn the Faithful and vindicate the Church from these silly accusations, the apologist cannot dispense himself from the task of showing how groundless are these accusations. This we shall do in the present chapter.

§ I. The Intolerance of the Church.

I. In What Sense is the Catholic Church Intolerant.

430. If we take this word in its true sense, that is to say, as *dogmatic or doctrinal* intolerance, the Church is certainly intolerant, and she does not consider it necessary to defend herself against this pretended reproach. *Dogmatic intolerance* is an essential prerogative of the truth; it is a natural and inevitable consequence of the very existence of the Catholic religion, which we have proved to be the only true religion, the only religion obligatory on man, who cannot be bound to believe and accept anything but the truth. *Dogmatic tolerance*, on the contrary, is nothing but *religious indifference*, which refuses to acknowledge any religion as exclusively true and obligatory on all. To reproach the Church with doctrinal intolerance is to reproach her with possessing and preaching divine truth: now, the first and the greatest duty of truth is to exclude everything contrary to it. Besides, it is not only the true religion that is intolerant, but all human science also must be intolerant. What is there more intolerant than mathematics? By the very fact that she is certain of possessing the whole religious truth, the Church must condemn every error contrary to it. Thus, as Bossuet writes: "The Catholic religion is the most severe

and least tolerant of all religions as to dogmatic errors;" and Jules Simon, a contemporary philosopher of the naturalistic school, admits that "the lawfulness of ecclesiastical intolerance is entirely beyond discussion."

We acknowledge without any hesitation that, as to matters of dogma, all other religious societies separated from Rome are not intolerant. J. J. Rousseau has said of Protestantism: "The Protestant religion is unavoidably tolerant through its own principle; it is essentially tolerant, it is as tolerant as it may possibly be, because the only dogma that it does not tolerate is that of intolerance." Such praise, for any religious doctrine or creed, is the most crushing refutation that can be made of its tenets.

But if the Catholic Church is rightfully intolerant towards all false or evil *doctrines* and towards all *vices*, as truth and goodness must necessarily be, she is on the other hand full of indulgence and mercy *for wayward sinners*. Established to save men, she spares nothing to snatch the souls of men from eternal ruin. Always faithful to the mission received from Jesus Christ, she confined herself, in converting the world, to preaching the Gospel, that is to say, she always proceeded by the way of persuasion, without using any constraint, or any force. Like her Divine Master, she has, at all times, suffered persecution and shed her blood for the salvation of souls. If at times she considered it right to chastise *her own rebellious children*, she exercised a right that no one dreamed of denying, and she has exercised it in a maternal way, aiming principally at their conversion and at the removal of scandal. We will now see that it was not so with heretical sects or other enemies of the Church. See "The Charity of the Church," by Cardinal Baluffi, ch. xxi, xxii.

II. Protestant Intolerance.

431. Strange inconsistency! The men, who cast upon the Church the utterly undeserved reproach of intolerance, are generally the very ones who are full of good-will towards Protestantism. Is this because in Protestantism they have met with true tolerance, approved of by sound reason Let us question history as written by Protestants themselves

and we will see, as Menzel, himself a Protestant, says, that "where Protestantism prevailed, there also prevailed intolerance."

432. 1. The first founder of Protestantism, whom his friends would wish to set up as a model apostle of tolerance and emancipator of free thought, though he himself went so far as to deny the existence of free-will in man, Luther, openly commanded his followers "to win heaven by the might of the sword, to raise themselves up to God upon mountainous piles of corpses." His war cry was: "Long live the Bible! Death to Papists." "It is necessary that every one should rush forth against the Pope, and kill him, with all who are around him and siding with him, emperors, kings, princes and nobles." "We must wash our hands in their blood." This diabolical purpose the audacious innovator has often declared in his writings.

These provocations to a general massacre, constantly repeated, produced but too often their dire effects. The Peasants' War, in whose origin and course the apostate monk had so large a part, is well known (A.D. 1525). As long as the ravages and cruelties of these wars were perpetrated in Catholic countries, the Reformer approved of the doings of those wreckless hordes of assassins; but when he saw them, under the leadership of Münzer, invading the countries, where the Reformation had been established, he set about exciting the Protestant princes against them. "Now, my princes," he cried, "to arms! to arms! Strike, drive your swords into them, kill from the front and from the rear, for there is nothing more diabolical than a seditious man; he is a dog who will rend you to pieces unless you kill him." "It is not only your right," he used to say to the Protestant princes, "it is your duty to establish the pure Gospel, to protect the new Churches, to destroy the authority of the Pope, and to allow no strange doctrine to spread itself." "Admirable times," he exclaims on another occasion, "when princes can more easily merit heaven by massacreing peasants and shedding blood, than others by saying prayers before God! Every peasant struck by death is lost body and soul, and belongs

to the devil for all eternity." More than one hundred thousand of these unfortunate creatures perished in these wars, and Luther gloried in these horrible massacres. "It is I," he cried out, "who shed this blood by order of God."

This was the cold cruelty that overflowed in the soul of the Reformation leader. The pillage of Churches and monasteries, the robbery of ecclesiastical property, armed revolt, the massacre of whole populations, a thirty-years war, which buried everything in blood and ruins, these are the great deeds by which Protestantism signalized its birth in Germany.

433. 2. What occurred in Switzerland? Calvin, the most infamous and cruel of tyrants, wrote an entire book to show that heretics should be put to death. Adding examples to precept, he caused Michäél Servetus to be burnt alive for the crime of heresy, and attended the execution in person. If Valentine Gentilis escaped at Geneva the fate of Servetus, it was owing to the retraction of his doctrines. Even that did not save him; as shortly after he was beheaded at Berne, for denying the mystery of the Holy Trinity. Jacques Gruet, tortured until his last breath; Antoni, Funch, Bolsec, Castalion, Ochino, Acioti, and a hundred others paid with their lives for their religious opinions and especially, the tyrant said, for the unpardonable audacity of having blamed the Reformers. To abstain from the services of the new worship, such as the sermon or the communion, constituted the crime of high treason and was punished accordingly. They made a crime even of thought, desire, the tendencies and inclinations of the heart. "Calvin," says Mr. Galiffe, a Protestant writer of Geneva, "established a reign of the most ferocious intolerance, the grossest superstitions, the most impious dogmas. . . . He prevailed at first by cunning, then by violence. . . That soul of mud craved for blood." This same man desired that the Anabaptists should be treated as brigands. "In the legislation conceived by this monster," says Audin, "we hear only these words: Death and blood everywhere! The scaffold or the funeral pile punished every resistance." All these cruelties were perpetrated because he defended the

thesis "Jure gladii coercendos esse haereticos" (Heretics must be controlled by the right of the sword). As to the historical truth of these facts the reader will find details and proofs in Audin's book, entitled "*Histoire de la vie, des ouvrages et des doctrines de Calvin*" (History of the life, works and doctrine of Calvin); see also "*vie de Mme de Maintenon*" (Life of Madam de Maintenon) by de Noailles.

Zwinglius was not in the least of a milder temper. To be convinced of this, it is sufficient to read his letter of May 4, 1525, to Ambroise Blaurer, cited by Janssen, in "*Ein zweites Wort an meine Kritiker.*" He there declares that it is permissible to massacre priests, if that be necessary to arrive at the abolition of images and of the Mass.

434. 3. The same revolting spectacle is seen in France. There also the Huguenot Calvinists aroused the furies of civil war; they pillaged Orléans, Pithiviers, Nimes, Auxerre, Bourgess, Montpellier, entire provinces, indeed, massacreing the inhabitants, destroying the Churches found in their way, casting into the rivers or hanging the priests and monks who fell into their hands. At Orthés, it is the entire population, numbering three thousand Catholics, who fall under their swords. In the single year of 1562, according to their own admission, they put to death 4000 priests and religious, devastated 20,000 churches and 90 hospitals. "Who does not know," says Bossuet, "the deeds of violence which the Queen of Navarre perpetrated upon priests and religious? People still show the towers from which Catholics were precipitated and the precipices into which they were cast." "*Histoire des variations des eglises protestantes*" (History of the Variations of the Protestant Churches), vol. II, book x.

435. 4. Intolerance was also rampant *in Denmark*, where Lutheranism was introduced under Christian II., surnamed the Nero of the North. Under Frederic I., successor of this prince, these horrors against members of religious orders were carried so far, that the Protestant historian Mallet *Histoire de Danemarck* (History of Denmark) vol. VI., could not refrain from saying, "In no country where the Reformation was established, did the monks suffer more cruelly than

in Denmark." It was death to all Catholic priests and death to every man who afforded them a refuge. In Sweden, which became Lutheran under Gustavus Vasa, the cruelty of this prince toward Catholics was so terrible and the massacres so frightful that Luther himself was indignant at them.

436. 5. The history of the Schism originated in England in the passions of a debauched king, shows that Henry VIII. condemned to the scaffold two queens, two cardinals, twenty archbishops and bishops, more than five hundred abbots, priors and monks, a multitude of learned men, dukes, earls and gentlemen, among whom was the celebrated Bl. Thomas Moore, and finally over seventy-two thousand Catholics of every rank. "I would wish to efface from our annals," says the anglican Fitz-William, author of the *Letters of Atticus*, "every trace of the long series of iniquities which accompanied the Reformation in England. Injustice and oppression, murder, rapine, and sacrilege are indelibly recorded in the history of those days. Such were the means by which the inexorable and sanguinary tyrant, Henry VIII., the founder of our religion, established the supremacy of his new Church. All who wished to preserve the religion of their fathers and remain attached to the authority, which he himself had taught them to revere, were treated as rebels and soon became his victims." It is particularly during the reign of the *Virgin Queen, good Queen Bess*, as Englishmen used to call her (A. D. 1559–1603), that persecution against the Catholics assumed a most barbarous and cruel character. This bastard daughter of Henry VIII. and Anna Boleyn, a mere concubine, put to death as many Catholics as her father; she wantonly committed atrocities, which horrified the world and which surpassed in cruelty even those of pagan antiquity. In Ireland she perpetrated massacres so dreadful that, according to the Protestant Lelam, "there were left to be governed by Her Majesty, Queen Elizabeth, so to say, nothing but ashes and corpses."

437. 6. No one can read without a shudder what the historian Kerroux relates, in volume II of his *Abrege' de*

l'histoire de la Hollande (Abridgment of the History of Holland), about the atrocious tortures which Catholics had to suffer in the *Low Countries*. He writes: "These were some among the torments that those eminent victims, the Catholics, had to suffer at the hands of the Dutch Calvinists. Their dislocated members, their bodies torn with scourges were wrapped in stuffs steeped in spirits, and set on fire, till the skin became shrunken and black, almost charred, and the muscles in many parts were laid bare. Sometimes burning sulphur and lighted torches were applied to the arm-pits and the soles of the feet. When thus tortured, they were exposed for several nights on the bare ground, without covering, and beaten at intervals with clubs to prevent them from having any sleep. They were given for food some wretched salt fish and salt meat, that they might suffer from thirst, and be refused, at their most earnest entreaties, a single cup of water. Hornets were placed on their stomachs, and their stings were left in the punctures. Sonoi, the Protestant governor of Friesland, sent a quantity of rats to that dread tribunal set up by Calvin, which were placed on the bodies of the Catholics, and provoked by the application of fire to gnaw the flesh and eat into the vitals of the dying Martyrs." It is well known that in the Provinces of Brabant and Flanders alone, the "Beggars" "*Les Gueux*," fanatic heretics of the blackest dye, overthrew in less than five days more than four hundred churches and cathedrals; that they committed against priests, religious and the Catholic people, atrocities, which would be deemed impossible, if the most unexceptional historical documents were not in existence to prove the dreadful truth of these accounts.

This was everywhere the conduct of Protestants toward those who wished to remain faithful to the ancient religion of their fathers. And, we must not forget, the reformers proclaimed as a fundamental dogma of the new religion *free inquiry* into the Sacred Scriptures, that is to say, *the right to believe what any one pleased!*

Here we add only three other Protestant testimonies.

Hallam in his "Constitutional History" writes as follows: "Persecution is the deadly original sin of the reformed churches; that which cools every honest man's zeal for their cause in proportion as his reading becomes more extensive." Miss Strickland in her "Queens of England" says that "there was not a sect of the Reformation that did not avow, as part of their religious duty, the horrible necessity of destroying some of their fellow creatures (mostly by burning them alive), on account of what they severally termed heretical tenets." A fit conclusion to these avowals is found in Luther's ukase when he ordered his followers "to wash their hands in the blood of Popes."

As we have treated this subject of the comparative severity and intolerance between Catholics on one side and Protestants on the other, we may dwell a little longer on this topic, and hear the opinion of Mr. Lecky, a writer not only not friendly, but even hostile to the Catholic Church. In his work entitled "Rationalism in Europe" (vol. I, p. 51, edit. 1870), he thus contrasts Catholic and Protestant intolerance:

"Catholicism was an ancient Church. She had gained a great part of her influence by vast services to mankind. She rested avowedly on the principle of authority. She was defending herself against aggression and innovation. . . She might point to the priceless blessings she had bestowed upon humanity, to the slavery she had destroyed, to the civilization she had founded, to the many generations she had led with honor to the grave. She might show how completely her doctrines were interwoven with the whole social system, how fearful would be the convulsion if they were destroyed, and how absolutely incompatible they were with the acknowledgment of private judgment. These considerations would not make her blameless, but they would at least palliate her guilt.

But what shall we say of a Church that was but a thing of yesterday, a Church that had as yet no services to show, no claims upon the gratitude of mankind; a Church that was by profession the creature of private judgment, and was in

reality generated by the intrigues of a corrupt court, which, nevertheless, suppressed by force a worship that multitudes deemed necessary to their salvation; and by all her organs and with all her energies persecuted those who clung to the religion of their fathers? What shall we say of a religion which comprised at most but a fourth part of the Christian world, and which the first explosion of private judgment shivered into countless sects, which was, nevertheless, so pervaded by the spirit of dogmatism that each of these sects asserted its destructive doctrines with the same confidence and persecuted with the same unhesitating violence, as a Church that was venerable with the homage of sixteen centuries? . . . So strong and so general was its intolerance, that for some time it was, I believe, truly said that there were more instances of partial toleration being advocated by Roman Catholics than by orthodox Protestants."

See concerning Protestant intolerance the work of Martinet: *Solution des grands problemes* (Solution of great Problems), that of Augustus Nicolas: *Du Protestantisme* Protestantism; and *Les Huguenots et les Gueux* (The Hugenots and the Beggars), by Kervyn de Lettenhove, more particularly, Vol. II, ch. xx. Points of History, ch. 2 and 6. Rohrbacher, "History of the Catholic Church," Vol. 12, p. 448–449, where the reader will find heart-rending details of the cruelties practiced by those heretics on unoffending Catholics. See also "The History of the Protestant Reformation," by Archbishop M. Spalding.

III. Intolerance of the Other Enemies of the Church.

438. The philosophy of the XVIII. century has not proven itself any more merciful or tolerant than Protestantism. J. J. Rousseau, the same author who so energetically condemned the dogma of intolerance, and who maintained that *not a particle of truth* could be found in any positive religion, does not hesitate to say that governments can *establish by law* a state religion, consequently a positive religion, and enforce its practice even under pain of death! "It is for the sovereign," he says in his book "*Contrat Social*"

(the Social Contract) "to determine the articles of this religion." Then he adds these words, where cruelty vies with impudence: "Not being able to oblige any one to believe in the articles of a State religion, the sovereign may, nevertheless, banish from his dominion any one who does not believe them, not as an impious man but as a dishonest member of society. . . . If any one, who has publicly acknowledged these dogmas, should act as if he did not believe them, *let him be punished with death!* He has committed the greatest of crimes, he has lied before the law." And yet, according to Rousseau, no one can be compelled to believe! Can anything be conceived more absurd, more incoherent than this? Here is, indeed, logic with a vengeance.

This intolerance of the sophist of Geneva is the same as that of certain so-called *humanitarian philosophers of our times.* There are some who go so far as to express regret that in 1793 the French revolutionists were wanting *in audacity;* they only wait, they say, for an occasion to have recourse to brutal force against Catholicism, in order to render its exercise *absolutely impossible and to stifle it in the mud.*

439. REMARK. It is true there have been Catholic rulers who, through excess of ill-regulated zeal, have had recourse to violence in order to convert infidels and sectaries; but in this they followed *their own personal impulses* and not the rules of the Church. The Church does not admit of this kind of apostolate, and the responsibility of what she condemns cannot be cast upon her. It is quite otherwise as to Protestantism and infidel philosophy. Here it was the founders of the Reformation themselves, it was the leaders of philosophism, who gave the signal and the example of the most atrocious intolerance. And yet, most remarkable circumstance, we do not hear the enemies of the Church condemning these atrocities. On the contrary, all countries, where Catholics are still oppressed, receive from them praise and encouragement, and they find in this intolerant conduct *examples worthy of imitation.* Is not this the height of injustice, partiality and inconsistency?

IV. Of the Maxim: Out of the Church there is no Salvation.

440. But at least, it will be said, the Catholic Church cannot exculpate herself from the reproach of intolerance and cruelty, because she proclaims that there is no salvation for those who die outside of her communion. How many are thus condemned by her to eternal damnation, solely because they do not belong to the Church of Rome! We have already given in a few words the answer to this difficulty. We consider it well, however, to enlarge somewhat more upon what we have said upon the subject. We will see if the old man whom he introduces in his book, and over whose fate J. J. Rousseau sheds his tears, deserves all this sympathy.[1]

The Catholic maxim is but a perfectly *reasonable* conclusion from what we have hitherto demonstrated. If the true religion, that of Jesus Christ, is *obligatory* for salvation, and if this religion is exclusively that of the Church of Rome, as it has been proved numberless times, it must be admitted that outside of *that* Church there is no salvation; in other words, no man is saved unless he belongs to it in some manner. It is not, therefore, the Church that should be reproached with upholding this maxim; if any reproach may reasonably be made against any one, it is against its *Divine Founder Himself*, who has made His religion obligatory upon man.

[1] Among those who attack the Church because of this maxim, the Protestants are the most conspicuous. Now this principle, with which they reproach the Church, is a logical consequence of the doctrine of their principal leaders themselves. They are, therefore, contradicting themselves. What right have they to bring up against us that very charge, which they must themselves admit to be contained in their own creed, and which is directly expressed in the formularies of faith drawn up in the first period of Protestantism? Here, for instance, is what we read in the Helvetic (Swiss) Confessions of 1565: "There is no salvation outside of the Church, as there was no salvation outside of the Ark; if man desires life, he must not separate himself from the true Church of Jesus Christ." The Saxon Confession, that of Belgium, that of Scotland, are no less explicit: "Outside of the Church," says the Calvinist Catechism of the XVII. century, "there is nothing but damnation; all those who separate themselves from the communion of the Faithful, to form a sect apart, cannot hope for salvation as long as they remain separated." Moreover, Calvin himself affirms, in his *Institutions*, "that outside of the Church man cannot hope for the pardon of sins nor for salvation." See Gousset: *De l'Eglise* (The Church).

But to realize the perfect justice and reasonableness of this maxim, it suffices to understand fully *the sense and extent* of its meaning, viz., to know what, according to Catholic doctrine, is necessary in order to have the right to heaven.

441. Let us at the beginning listen to a grave authority: "In this phrase: *Outside of the Church there is no salvation*," says Cardinal Dechamps, "there is, as in every penal law, one word which, though not expressed, is easily understood and supplied, it is the word *voluntarily*, for the reason that every penal law presupposes *guilt*, and that guilt, in its turn, presupposes two conditions: *the fact and the intention*. To the question then: Does the Church believe in the loss of those who, being born and brought up where they could not know the Church, who are in invincible ignorance of the law of Jesus Christ, but have faithfully practiced all the good that they knew, the answer must be: No. This means that no one is lost except through his own fault.

Moreover, the theological axiom already mentioned: "To him who does what is in his power, God does not refuse *grace*," is perfectly applicable to the present question. He who has followed the light of reason and lived conformably to what he believed to be the truth, cannot be condemned. "A man," says the same cardinal, "may *in his heart* belong to the Church without belonging to her as to her external relations. Is it not evident that every man of good faith belongs to the Church in his heart, because he would enter the Church, if it were known to him that the Catholic Church is the true Church of Christ? Is not this the case with all men who have a sincere and general desire to adhere to the truth, to do the will of God? In other words, it is in their case a question of baptism of desire, *implicitly and sufficiently contained in the general intention*, as St. Thomas says, of making use of the means of salvation granted to men by Divine Providence. The persons, therefore, who are disposed to throw themselves into the arms of their Mother the Church, if they knew her, are, already, in the eyes of God, considered as her children, and *will infallibly receive from God the light necessary for salvation*. Jesus Christ died for all men, and the

graces granted through this victim, which Eternal Justice had seen from the very beginning of time immolated for the salvation of mankind, *occisus ab origine mundi* (Apoc. 13, 8), have flowed forth upon all men without any exception. "Christ," as the Gospel assures us (John i., 9), "is the true light, which enlighteneth every man that cometh into this world." Hence, no man is excluded from the benefits of redemption *except through his own fault*, and by his obstinate resistance to grace, and every man will be judged according to the graces or means of salvation, which he may have received. Can there be a doctrine more merciful and at the same time more terrible; more merciful to those unfortunates who are blind to the truth when their ignorance is not of a guilty character, and more terrible for the ingrates, who, to escape from the light that surrounds them, go seeking in the midst of *darkness* for reasons against the justice of God?" *Le libre examen de la liberte de la foi* (Free examination of the liberty of Faith, 4th conference). The reader may also peruse with benefit the excellent remarks of Mgr. Gousset, set forth in a note of third discourse of Cardinal Dechamps. They treat of the way in which we should understand the question of the necessity of baptism, the number of the elect, etc.

As to children who die without baptism, and the same thing must be said of adults *who have never enjoyed the use of reason*, we have already said what is to be thought of their destiny. They will enjoy that natural happiness, which would have been ours, if we had not been raised to the supernatural state, and they will only be deprived of the *degree* of happiness resulting from the intuitive vision of God; a purely gratuitous gift which was due to no man. (See n. 267.)[1]

[1] A great many theologians assign to original sin, as its proper penalty, the privation only of supernatural happiness (the vision of God), a felicity which, at all events, is not due to human nature. St. Thomas maintains that children dying without baptism not only do not suffer the pain of *sense*, but that they do not suffer any sadness from the pain of *loss*, that is, from the privation of the beatific vision. . . Theologians of credit admit that the children will enjoy natural happiness, more or less perfect: *naturali beatitudine fruentur*.

All theologians make a distinction between negative infidelity and positive infidelity. *Negative* infidelity is not a sin. It is that of per-

We shall add that, if baptism by water is necessary for all who know of its necessity and who can receive it, it may, however, be replaced in exceptional cases *by the baptism of blood* and *by the baptism of desire*. Baptism of blood is equivalent to that of water as to the spiritual regeneration, and replaces it for those, who have not as yet received the use of reason, when they are put to death for the cause of Jesus Christ. This is why the Church celebrates the feast of the Holy Innocents, massacred by King Herod. Baptism of desire replaces baptism by water for those who, knowing the necessity of the latter and being unable to receive it for some reason or other, have the explicit desire to receive it, accompanied by perfect contrition for any grievous sins which they may have committed.

Let us also quote here a few words from a judicious writer, the Abbé Ant. Pirenne, in his *Etudes philosophiques sur less principales questions de la religion révélée* (Philosophical studies of the principal questions of Revealed Religion). "Let us suppose that some one, who is not a Christian (and it is the same as to heretics and schismatics), dies loving God for Himself, viz , for His sake, and above all things, he is saved by that very fact. For with supernatural charity he has everything. Charity effaces all his sins. And observe, that *the smallest* degree of charity is sufficient, for the essence of a virtue does not consist in its *intensity*; a drop of water is water as well as the whole ocean, and the *quantity* of a thing does not affect *its nature*. Thus charity sufficient for justification exists even with some attachment to venial sin; especially, it exists without any sensible devotion. You are, therefore, saved, provided you quit this life loving God *for Himself and above everything* which might draw you to the commission of mortal sin. You are saved whatever be the circumstances in which you may be placed. If at the su-

sons who do not believe in divine revelation, because they are ignorant of it without their fault. *Positive* infidelity, on the contrary, is a sin, and it is attributed to those to whom revelation has been sufficiently proposed and made known. These will certainly be condemned to the pain of loss as well as to that of sense, because they are guilty of the actual sin of positive infidelity. Muzzarelli: *Du salut des païens* (The salvation of pagans).

preme moment, whether you be a pagan, heretic, or sinner, you receive from God the gift of charity, even in a very slight degree, which does not take from you the affection to venial sin, you have enough for salvation, for charity makes contrition *perfect;* and charity and perfect contrition comprise at least implicitly the desire for the sacraments of baptism and confession, if they could be received."

If we wish to know by what means charity is communicated to the Faithful, here is the answer given by Leibnitz, borrowed from Catholic theologians: "God will give what is necessary for salvation to all men who do what humanly depends upon them, even though a miracle were required."

442. To recapitulate: among infidels, heretics and schismatics, the Catholic doctrine excludes from salvation for not having embraced the true Faith, only those who have not known revealed truth because they did not *wish* to know it, and those who knowing it sufficiently have *refused* to embrace it. Those alone are *de facto* bound to enter the Church who know the Church to be the necessary means of salvation. The formula "out of the Church there is no salvation" is, therefore, every way reasonable and logical; and if it be made a matter of reproach, it is through error or bad faith; through error, if its precise and complete sense be not known; through bad faith, if there be a refusal to acknowledge it when they know it.

We are now prepared to draw from the principles stated some practical conclusions concerning the eternal salvation of validly baptized Protestants and of un-baptized non-Catholics.

"If a man is in *invincible* ignorance of the true Faith, and yet observes the moral law, will he be lost? I answer that such a man will die in the Catholic Church. Either in his life, or at the moment of his death, the Providence of God will give him the means, *extraordinary* means if necessary, to know the true Faith, as far at least as is indispensably necessary for salvation. We must here distinguish between two classes of persons, the baptized and the unbaptized. As this is a subject but little understood, and seldom well ex-

plained, particular attention is asked to the following remarks:

With regard to persons born in Protestant countries and validly baptized, who, from want of instruction and opportunity, have never come to the knowledge that the Catholic Church is the only true Church of Christ, if they have never committed a mortal sin, or have atoned for their sins by perfect contrition, united to a sincere desire of doing all that God may require of them, they will be saved in the ordinary way, as members of the Catholic Church. Such persons are in reality Catholics; they have entered the Church by valid baptism, and are only outwardly separated from her communion by *inculpable* error. According to Catholic doctrine there is but one baptism; it is always valid, whether administered by a Christian, Jew, infidel, or heathen, provided it is conferred with the rites established by Christ and with the intention of conferring what Christ has instituted; every man who is thus baptized becomes, at the moment of his baptism, a member of the Catholic Church. In some countries there are large numbers of Protestants validly baptized who are *invincibly* ignorant of the true Church; they are members of the Catholic Church, and, without knowing it, die in the Catholic communion. All who are validly baptized remain Catholics, until they apostatize by a culpable adherence to an error against faith, or *culpably* neglect to inquire, when a well-founded suspicion of error arises in their mind. Hence the hope that great numbers of Protestants may thus be saved, not indeed as *Protestants*, but as *members of the Catholic Church*, the only true Church of Christ.

The case of other non-Catholics, but unbaptized, differs considerably from that of baptized Protestants. Such persons, who are in error *inculpably*, observe the moral law as made known to them by the light of reason, and serve God to the best of their ability, according to the light which they possess, and are ready to do all that Heaven may desire from them, will certainly be saved. They may never receive the baptism of water, but for them

what is called in the Catholic Church the baptism of desire, is sufficient. Their efforts to please God include the desire to know the true Faith, and willingness to embrace it; and as to sanctifying grace, which is also necessary for salvation, God, who is unwilling that men should perish, when they do their utmost to please him, infuses into their souls, in the course of their lives, or at the moment of their death, the same sanctifying grace that is conferred by the baptism of water. If they fall into mortal sin, they may receive the grace to elicit an act of perfect contrition, and thereby obtain forgiveness. Their salvation is not according to the *ordinary* course of Providence, but the result of an *extraordinary* grace, conferred in view of the merits of Christ. By the baptism of desire they become members of the true Church of Christ, the Catholic Church, and are saved only as members of her communion.

In other words, there is only one way to heaven, but there are several ways that lead to the Catholic Church, for, besides the baptism of water, there is the baptism of blood, or martyrdom suffered by an unbaptized person for the faith of Christ, and the baptism of desire, of which we have just spoken. How many are saved by the baptism of desire, whether they are few or numerous, is known to God alone; we may confidently leave it in the hands of God, whose bonndless mercy extends to every human soul, and never allows anyone to perish except through his own grievous fault. The Catholic Church says with St. Thomas Aquinas that if a man sincerely desires to know the truth, and observes the moral law to the best of his power, God, if necessary, will send an angel to enlighten him, and lead him into the Catholic Church, rather than allow him to perish. Thus we read in the Acts (x, 3), that an angel was sent to the Centurion; and it is worthy of observation that the Centurion received the Holy Ghost, and therefore became a member of the Church, before he received the baptism of water.

But we must remember that all this holds true only in regard to those who are in *invincible* ignorance of the true

Church. It does not by any means apply to that class of persons, which I fear is very numerous, who have an opportunity of knowing the truth, and wilfully neglect it; who close their eyes against the light, stifle the warnings of conscience, and live in sin; who refuse to examine the evidences of Catholic Faith, for fear of being convinced of its truth, and, come what may, resolutely determine to die out of the Catholic Church. They do not wish to make the sacrifices which their conversion to the Catholic Church would require. They act like the Areopagites (Acts xvii, 22), or Felix, the Roman Governor, who told St. Paul that they would hear him another time; or like the Jews who stopped their ears, and stoned St. Stephen. They cannot claim that their ignorance is *invincible;* they sin against the Holy Ghost, and if they die in that condition, must be lost forever."—"*Catholicity, Protestantism, Infidelity,*" F. X. Weninger, S. J.

What has been said above is the doctrine held by the most distinguished Catholic theologians and writers, and is in perfect harmony with the teaching of the late Pontiff Pius IX. In his allocution of December 9, 1854, we read the following words: "It is, indeed, of faith that no one can be saved outside the Apostolic Roman Church; that this Church is the one ark of salvation; that he who has not entered it will perish in the deluge. But, on the other hand, it is equally certain that were a man to be *invincibly* ignorant of the true religion, he would not be held guilty in the sight of God for not professing it."

As Fr. Russo remarks in his excellent book "The True Religion," if invincible ignorance may thus shield the un-Catholic Christian, why, it is asked, should Catholics do so much to induce him to change his religious belief? Why are they so desirous that he should become a member of the Roman Church? It is *first*, because truth is infinitely better than error, however honestly the latter may be held. *Second*, because the good faith, which may exist in the sectarian, cannot be supposed to be present in every case, particularly with regard to persons of culture and the ministers of the Gospel, who have ample opportunities of studying the

evidences of the Church of Christ. *Third*, because, even when the good faith does exist, the soul may be stained with mortal sin. And how many may have such perfect contrition for their sins, as to obtain forgiveness without the sacrament of penance? And how many do really know that true contrition is for non-Catholics *their only means* of reconciliation with God? *Fourth*, because we desire that our separated brethren should realize and enjoy to the full extent during their life time the immense benefits our Divine Savior has bestowed upon the Church for the salvation of man. *Fifth*, because it is a sacred duty of God's Minister to carry out the designs of the world's Redeemer, who founded *one* Church, and who wills that in His Church there should be but one flock, as there is but one Shepherd, his Vicar upon earth.

References.—1. "The True Religion," by Rev. N. Russo, S. J.; ch. xiv., "Salvation out of the Church;" ch. xv., "The Salvation of Unbaptized Children."

2. "Ecclesiastical Review," July 1, 1902. "Extra Ecclesiam Nulla Salus," No Salvation Outside the Church.

3. "Rational Religion," by Rev. John Conway; ch. ix., The meaning of "Out of the Church no Salvation."

4. "Brownson's Works," vol. 5. "Extra Ecclesiam nulla Salus."

5. "The Sincere Christian," by Bishop Hay, "An inquiry whether Salvation can be had without *True Faith*, etc."

6. Catholic Truth Society, vol. v., "Outside the Church there is no Salvation."

7. Balmes, "Letters to a Sceptic on Religious Matters," ch. 15, 16.

8. "American Catholic Quarterly Review," vol. 9, p. 45, for 1884.

§ II. The Vicious Circle.

443. Among the charges laid at the door of Catholic controversialists by Protestant writers is that which gives the title to this article. They are accused of arguing in a circle in their demonstration of the truth of the Catholic Religion,

because, it is said, they prove the infallible authority of the Church by the Scriptures, and then prove the divine inspiration of the Scriptures by the infallible authority of the Church. This objection was made originally by Dr. Stillingfleet (d. 1699) an Anglican bishop, and then repeated in nearly all the Protestant works. It has been completely refuted by Catholic theologians, whose answer is thus briefly summed up by Dr. Brownson, vol. 5, p. 235: "We beg leave to say to the editor of the "Princeton Review," that if we reason in a circle, it is not a *vicious* circle. For we do not prove the Church by the Scriptures in the same sense in which we prove the Scriptures by the Church. We take the Scriptures, when reasoning with those who profess to admit them, not as the word of God, but as authentic historical documents, to prove the foundation and commission of the Church; and then we take the Church, not to prove that the Scriptures are authentic historical documents (what is already demonstrated from other evidence extrinsic to the Church), but to show that they are divinely inspired, the written word of God. Is there here anything resembling what logicians call a *vicious* circle?" The same writer, turning, as the saying is, the tables against his adversaries, shows (vol. 8, p. 426) that Protestantism is forced by its own principles always to move in a vicious circle, for it proves its rule of faith by its belief, and its belief by its rule of faith. Then he adds: "We see no way by which it can get out of this circle. It is not only as a Catholic we have felt this difficulty; we felt it as a Protestant, when we had the misfortune to be a Presbyterian, like our learned friend, the Princeton Professor."

444. Though the preceding remarks may suffice to dispose of the charge here referred to, yet we cannot deprive our readers of the thorough and very able refutation given by Bishop England (vol. 1, p. 105–106). It is as follows:

"Dr. Watts, in his Treatise of Logic, and other Protestant writers of his description, charge Roman Catholics with gross and palpable absurdity in their arguments, and ex-

emplify the sophism of the *Vicious Circle*, by reference to the argument of Catholics, viz.:

"A vicious circle is, when two propositions, equally uncertain, are used to prove each other. Thus, Catholics prove the authority of the Scriptures by the infallibility of their Church, and then prove the infallibility of their Church from the authority of the Scriptures."

To a school-boy this appears a formidable barrier against Popery, and many a sage professor has learnedly declaimed against Popish absurdity in the detail of the exemplification. Stamped with the authority of a *dictum* of the schools, the example passes with equal currency as the definition.

Let us meet the mighty adversary. To do so as thoroughly as we may, we must take the following three several cases.

Case 1. A Catholic argues with a person who believes in the authority of the Scriptures, but who does not believe in the doctrine of the infallibility of the Church. No one will tell us that the said Catholic is guilty of bad logic and is a sophist, when he thus addresses such a person—"Sir, you acknowledge this book to be authority; I shall show you from several passages thereof, that the Church is infallible." This is not a vicious circle, for there is no question between them of the authority of the Scriptures, and to such a person the Catholic does not prove the authority of the Scriptures by the infallibility of the Church. Hence, in this case, there is no vicious circle, for if he proves the infallibility of the Church from the authority of the Scriptures, he only proves that which has been questioned from that of which there was no question.

Case 2. A Catholic argues with a person who acknowledges the infallibility of the Church, but questions and doubts the authority of certain books of Holy Writ. No one can say it would be sophistry to address such a person in these words—"Sir, you allow the body of true believers, that is the Church, does certainly know what God has revealed, and can point out with infallible certainty the books which do contain His revelations. Sir, that Church testifies to you that these books do contain His revelation. Therefore, by

your principle, you must receive these books as the word of God."

This certainly is not proving one questionable proposition by another, and then proving the second by the first. But it is proving that which has been questioned and of which there was doubt by that of which there was no doubt. This is no sophistry.

Case 3. A Catholic argues with a person who does not believe either in the infallibility of the Church or in the authority of the Scriptures. In this case he cannot assume either as a principle. What is he to do? What would a Protestant do? The Catholic can do at least as much. The Protestant says that without the authority of an infallible Church he can prove the authority of the Scriptures. The same arguments will, in the mouth of a Catholic, lead to the same conclusion. Therefore, *if it be possible* for the Protestant, it is possible for the Catholic—therefore the Catholic needs not the infallibility of the Church to do what his neighbor can do without it.

Having proved the authority of the Scriptures thus, the Catholic may next proceed upon what he has proved, now assuming as a principle that of which there can be no doubt. Thus we are brought to case 1, in which there is no sophism.

Or the Catholic may find, without the authority of the Scripture, reasons to convince a person, that if God speaks He must establish some mode by which man may infallibly find out what He teaches; and next that this mode is by receiving the testimony of the great body of the Church; and thus we are brought to case 2, in which there is no sophism.

445. REMARK BY THE EDITOR. It is advisedly said—"*if it be possible*," for we hold and shall soon prove that whoever discards the infallible authority of the Catholic Church becomes utterly unable to demonstrate the Divine origin and inspiration of the Scriptures. In other words, the only irresistible argument, that can be alleged against all opponents to prove that the Bible is the Word of God, is that derived from the living, unerring voice of the Catho-

lic Church, the heaven-appointed guardian, witness, preserver and interpreter of Holy Writ. Moreover, we must here bear in mind the fact that a Catholic theologian, even in the third case referred to above, can make his demonstration without incurring the sophism of the vicious circle; for he demonstrates the existence, character and office of the Church by arguing from the Scriptures, not as a Divinely inspired book, but simply as an authentic, reliable record of God's dealings with man: a record, whose authenticity rests on a far firmer foundation than that of any other book; for, to speak only of the New Testament, that Sacred Record carries with it the unbroken witness, authority and tradition of nineteen hundred years of Christian belief.

"Thus, whether a Catholic argues with a person who allows the authority of Scripture, but does not allow Church infallibility; or argues with a person who allows Church infallibility, but does not allow Scriptural authority; or argues with a person who does not allow either; he proceeds to prove both points without sophistry: he does not argue in a vicious circle—he is not a violator of the rules of sound sense or good logic—and Dr. Watts and his imitators either were very ignorant of the manner in which Catholics argue, or very ignorant of what is meant by the sophism of a vicious circle—or were dishonest men who deceived their pupils upon an important subject, and who bore false testimony against the best and most numerous and most enlightened society in the whole world.

We leave to their admirers and followers their choice of the several portions of this good disjunctive proposition, and we trust that each day will add new light to the intellect, and new desires to the will, so that true knowledge may increase, sophistry be detected and exposed, and the most important concerns of men be brought more closely under the eye of reason and the regulation of correct judgment."

"A little learning is a dangerous thing;
Drink deep, or taste not the Pierian spring.
Those shallow draughts intoxicate the brain;
But drinking largely sobers us again."—*Pope.*

446. In the preceding quotation from Bishop England we furnished to our readers a complete refutation of the well known sophism of the Vicious Circle, which non-Catholics at times bring as an argument against the Catholic Church, and we moreover stated the fact that whoever discards and rejects her infallible authority becomes utterly unable to demonstrate, in a convincing manner, the divine origin and inspiration of the Scriptures. In other words, whosoever does not admit the infallibility of the Catholic Church cannot prove that the Bible, or any part of it, is the word of God. To complete the discussion of this most important subject, we will present to our readers the following very cogent and judicious remarks of Rev. Francis E. Gigot, S. S., taken from his recent work entitled "General Introduction to the Study of Holy Scripture." The learned Sulpician professor proves what we have asserted, viz., that the only irresistible argument to demonstrate against all opponents the divine inspiration of the Bible is that derived from the living, unerring, authoritative voice of the Catholic Church, the heavenly appointed guardian, witness, preserver and interpreter of Holy Writ.

Before proceeding to state the proofs upon which Catholics rest their belief in the inspired character of the Bible, it may not be amiss to explain and examine the position of Protestants in that regard. The importance of the question for the latter cannot be exaggerated.[1] Catholics build their faith primarily on the teaching of a living Church, whereas Protestants rest their whole belief on the written Word of God. They have, therefore, to establish by irresistible arguments the divine character of the sacred books of the Old and New Testaments. A difficult task, at which the ablest minds among them have assiduously labored, but with results far from satisfactory, as we shall see presently, and as, in fact, some of the most enlightened Protestants candidly confess. One of them,[2] in an inductive essay on

1 Cfr. R. S. Foster, "The Supernatural Book," p. 34.

2 Robert F. Horton, "The Inspiration and the Bible," p. 5, seventh edition, London, 1896.

Biblical Inspiration, writes pertinently: "The point which strikes us is that Christians are more certain that the Bible is inspired than they are of the grounds of their certainty.[1] . . . The belief may be well grounded, and yet no one who holds it may be adequately able to state the grounds, and all the statements put together and harmonized may still leave one in some astonishment how a conviction so sure and so momentous should rest upon so slender and wavering a foundation."

447. We must bear in mind that, to demonstrate the divine character of Holy Scripture, there are grounds common to Catholics and to Protestants. Several of the arguments advanced by Protestants in favor of the divine character of the Bible have been used with great effect by Catholic apologists in our century and before. The elevating character of the Sacred Scriptures, their super-human contents, and their organic unity, are grounds common to all believers in Holy Writ, and when set forth in striking manner, are very helpful to souls struggling against infidelity. Catholic theologians, however, while mentioning these as a confirmation of the Christian belief in inspiration, prefer to appeal to *authority* as proof in favor of this doctrine.

The first ground which is common to Catholic and to Protestant scholars, is the authority of Christ and His Apostles. On both sides they point out how every man who recognizes the divine character of Christ and believes in His heavenly mission, must regard as inspired all the books of the Old Testament, because He either quoted them explicitly as the Word of God, or referred to them in general terms, such as "the Scripture," "the Holy Scripture," etc., the obvious meaning of which at the time was that they had been written under a special divine influence. On both sides, too, they appeal to the testimony of the Apostles, who spoke of the Old Testament Scriptures in exactly the same terms as their Divine Master, and unquestionably

[1] This is indeed true of Protestants, but not of Catholics. Cfr. W. H. Mallock, "The Intellectual Future of Catholicity," in *The Nineteenth Century*, for November, 1899.

shared the belief of their Jewish contemporaries in the inspiration of all their contents.

The second ground common to Catholics, and to a certain number of Protestant scholars, is the testimony of the early Church. Apart from the infallible character of her teaching, the early Church bears witness to the fact that when the sacred writers had not yet all left this world, or had but recently disappeared, her great teachers, such as St. Clement, St. Polycarp, St. Justin, St. Irenæus, etc., had learned to regard as *divine*, and to quote as the *words of the* Holy Ghost, the writings of the Old and New Testaments. Thus, then, the human testimony of the early Church may be appealed to by Catholics and Protestants, in order to complete whatever might be missing in the preceding argument to prove that *all* the books of the Bible should be regarded as inspired.

It should, however, be borne in mind, as already pointed out, that once this testimony of the early Church is regarded as valid, the inspiration of the deutero as well as of the proto-canonical books of the Old Testament, should be admitted, since it is a historical fact that the early Church held these two classes of books as equally sacred and inspired.

448. It must, however, be admitted that there are grounds special to Catholics in favor of inspiration, to which no Protestant of any denomination can appeal consistently with his fundamental principle, viz., the rejection of the infallible authority of the Roman Catholic Church and of the testimony of Tradition (n. 351, 352).

Over and above the grounds which are common to Protestants and Catholics, there is the distinctly Catholic argument, which rests the belief in the inspiration of the Bible directly on the divine authority of a living Church. It is plain that whatever difficulties may be raised against the doctrine of Biblical Inspiration in the name of history, of higher criticism, geology, etc., Catholics will ever find a solid ground for their faith on this point in the simple consideration that the inspired character of the Bible is certain

beyond all doubt, since the Church, speaking with divine and consequently infallible authority, teaches it as a truth revealed by God. This is the ground which Catholic theologians and ecclesiastical writers naturally appeal to after they have established the right of a living Church to teach Revelation with divine authority; and it is the proof upon which St. Augustine—and no doubt countless minds after him—felt it necessary to fall back upon when he said: "I would not believe the Gospel, unless the authority of the Church moved me thereto."

As it has been demonstrated above (n. 430), fair-minded historians cannot contest to the Catholic Church her well merited reputation of meekness and mercy in dealing with rebellious subjects. But here her enemies cry out: "How do you reconcile your assertion with the rigors of the Inquisition?" This is the charge made against her in books, reviews, journals and pamphlets of writers opposed to our Faith. It is, then, important to treat this question, which has given rise to so many odious declamations and bitter invectives.

§ III. The Inquisition.

449. The enemies of the Catholic Church are in the habit of casting up against her the word Inquisition as if it were a condemnation without appeal.

It is well to remark at the onset that, except in the case of a few people, of slight education at the best, who permit themselves to be taken unawares and led away, the hatred of the Inquisition is confounded with hatred of the Church.

We know from their literary works, novels, plays, journals, etc., the tactics of the enemies of that institution. Their aim is to strike at the *imagination*, and excite the *feelings* by a moving picture or by a skilful and dramatic arrangement of incidents. These writers are careful not to inform their readers that the use of the torture and other severe penalties, resorted to at the time of the Inquisition, entirely opposed as those means are to modern customs, was in full conformity with the penal code of past centuries, and *habit-*

ually used by all the tribunals of those times in all countries. In the eyes of these writers, the moment blood is shed or fire lit, the cause is judged and the tribunal is held to be in the wrong. They do not reason, they declaim; they do not try to convince their readers, but only seek to arouse their indignation. It is plain that honest men do not act in this way.

It is not thus that history should be written. It should have no other aim than that of telling the truth. "Its first law," says Leo XIII. in the Brief on Historical Studies (August 18, 1893), "is to assert nothing false and to have no fear of telling the truth." The Church also only requires the truth, and we, her defenders, do not intend to use any other weapon than that in her service. Let us, therefore, reason this matter out, and tell the *whole truth* concerning the Inquisition, as much at least as it is possible to do within the narrow limits in which we are obliged to confine ourselves.

I.—Origin and Nature of the Ecclesiastical Inquisition.

450. Above all, it is necessary to distinguish carefully the *Ecclesiastical* Inquisition from the *Spanish* Inquisition.

1. *Inquisition* in general means the searching for heretics, with the view of repressing their proselytism or of converting them. In this sense the Inquisition dates from the very beginning of the Church; it was always the *strict duty of the Popes and Bishops* to fight heresy, to prevent its spread, either by means of gentleness and persuasion, or, when these failed, by punishment.

2. However, by *Inquisition* is generally understood, *a court of justice*, called the Holy Office, *ecclesiastical and also civil*, established to enquire into the crime of heresy and to punish the guilty. This special tribunal only dates from the beginning of the XIII. century, when Pope Innocent III. founded it to repress the heresy of the Albigenses and the Waldenses. Reviving the heresy of the Manicheans, these sectaries spread, with their errors, the spirit of revolt, and, with weapons in their hands, they threatened to destroy both the Church and the State. Every effort was made to

bring them back to their duty by instruction and persuasion, but in vain. Then the two powers thus menaced *united their forces against the common enemy;* to the ecclesiastical power fell the duty of ascertaining the crime, to the other that of inflicting the penalty.

This *Ecclesiastical Inquisition* always had for its purpose to preserve the Catholic people from the poison of heresy, and the State from the revolts which were its usual consequence. The duty of the Inquisitor was generally confided to legates or delegates, among whom were distinguished in the first rank the Sons of St. Dominic, but only from the year 1223, that is to say, *twelve years after the death of their Founder*, which does not prevent the enemies of the Church from transforming this Saint into a *Grand Inquisitor*.

Instituted by the mother of all Churches, successively introduced into nearly all parts of the Christian world, the Ecclesiastical Inquisition was undoubtedly the work of the Roman Pontiffs, who never regretted having established it.

451. 3. Quite different was the *Spanish Inquisition*, founded by Ferdinand and Isabella in 1481, to preserve, with the Christian faith, the Spanish nation from the conspiracies of the Jews and Moors, who feigned to be Christians in order to carry out their wicked designs against the Church, as well as against the State. In this tribunal there existed two distinct jurisdictions, one of which depended upon the Church, the other upon the State. But in Spain the civil power had so great a preponderance that many historians, though far from favorable to Catholicism, consider the Spanish Inquisition as *more of a political than of a religious* institution.

We admit that Sixtus IV. did approve the *first project* of the Spanish Inquisition, and that he sanctioned its fundamental statute. It was from the Holy See that the *Ecclesiastical* Inquisitors received their jurisdiction and all their *spiritual* powers. The king, however, had obtained from the Pope the power to nominate them for the office.

452. OBJECT OF THE DISCUSSION. All discussion concerning the Inquisition may be reduced to the two following

questions, which are altogether distinct from each other.

First Question. Was the institution of this tribunal legitimate *in principle;* in other words, was it in accordance with right and justice?

Second Question. Were the proceedings of the Inquisition, as we know them through reliable history, deserving of the condemnation with which they are stigmatized, and can they be made a subject of reproach against the Church? We must not forget that in all this discussion there is no question of infidels, pagans and Jews, over whom the Church has no jurisdiction, and whom the Church never pretended to constrain, but that it refers solely to Christians, that is to say, to people whom regeneration by baptism *had subjected to her laws.* "The former," says St. Thomas, "must not be compelled to obedience to the Church; the others, on the contrary, should be coerced: *contra vero, alteri sunt cogendi.*"

II.—Lawfulness of the Inquisition in Principle.

453. **A.** On the part of the Church. For a Catholic there can be no doubt on the subject. Popes and Councils, saints and doctors, the Scripture and tradition, proclaim that the Church, as a perfect society, has the right, and it is her duty, to watch over the purity of the faith, and to inflict punishment, even corporal punishment, upon those of *her children* who forsake the truth and become a stumbling block to their brethren. This undeniable right, which flows from the very powers, which Jesus Christ confided to her, the Church has always exercised; she always regarded the crimes of heresy, apostacy and sacrilege deserving of punishment as much as attacks against the property, the honor and the life of man.

This *doctrine* and this *conduct* of the Church are perfectly reasonable and legitimate.

It is the right and the duty of every perfect society to efficaciously lead its members to the purpose of its institution, and to watch over its own preservation. The Church being a perfect society, established by Christ, and provided by her Divine Founder with everything necesssary for her

preservation and propagation, possesses therefore this right, and can consequently enact laws and punish those of her subjects who will not obey them. If they prove themselves in every way refractory and rebellious, *devios et contumaces*, according to the expression of Benedict XIV., it is the right and the duty of the Church, as a mother, tender it is true but free from weakness, to correct them, in order that punishment may bring them back to due submission and prevent others from being led away by evil example. She does as the father of a family, when by wise and effective measures, he corrects his children and endeavors to preserve his hearth from everything that might disturb its peace and happiness. She does as governments do every day, when by a system of vigorous precautions and sanitary enactments, they prevent the introduction of cholera or other epidemics; or again, when they appoint a body of special agents to look after malefactors, conspirators, assassins, to deliver them over to the vengeance of the law, and to render impossible the execution of their evil designs.

What the rod of the father is to the family, what to civil society are sanitary cordons, medical commissions, the police and the courts, the Inquisition was all this for religious society, that is to say, a means of preservation for itself and for its members.

454. **B.** ON THE PART OF THE STATE. When it comes to judging of the legitimacy of an institution, we must go back *to the times during which it was established.* There is no one who does not know that at the time of the Inquisition *European society was profoundly Christian*; people were as convinced of the truth of Catholic dogmas as in our day *in modern society they are convinced of the truths of the principles of natural law*; they thought with good reason that revolt against God was no less culpable than revolt against the king.

Rulers and people, moreover, considered the preservation of the Catholic religion, in their eyes the only true and divine religion, as a *social* good of far greater importance than all worldly possessions. The legislation of all the countries

of Europe was founded upon the close alliance of Church and State. Consequently, every disobedience to the laws of religion became amenable to the civil law as soon as the transgressions became manifest *by exterior acts*.

In such a condition of things nothing could be more natural than *the establishment of tribunals*, whose purpose it was to ascertain by honest and legal means *exterior* violations of the religious law, to distinguish *obstinate* heretics from those who only yielded to temporary error, to punish the really guilty and proclaim the innocence of the others. These tribunals were as legitimate as in our day are the courts called upon to judge crimes against the State or against the person, the reputation or the fortune of its subjects. We say *exterior* violations, for it is clear that the interior secret of conscience is accessible to God alone; consequently human law cannot make laws for *interior acts*, nor punish violations which are not outwardly produced. Hence the principle of canon law, "*Ecclesia non Judicat de internis.*"

It is because they were imbued with these *truths* that Theodosius the Great, Justinian, Charlemagne, Otho the Great, Louis XI., all the rulers and all civilized nations did not think that to punish heresy and apostacy was to do violence to conscience.

455. CONCLUSION. *In a society constituted according to the principles, which we have just set forth and in presence of legislative measures enacted accordingly*, no one can reasonably deny that the Church acted with wisdom, by establishing *conjointly with the temporal power*, to which it left the task of inflicting the merited punishment, a tribunal to ascertain with greater certainty and guarantee of justice the real culprits, and to take cognizance of offenses rightly considered as most detrimental both to social order and religious faith.

456. REMARK. If there are men who find it difficult to admit this conclusion, it is because we live in an atmosphere which is saturated with errors. To favor the spread of evil, and for their own security, the enemies of religion

constantly represent all *repression* of impiety and heresy as an outrage against what they falsely call the sacred rights of conscience.

It is nevertheless beyond all doubt that no man can claim for himself the right to do evil. It is certain that man has not and cannot have, as some pretend in our day, the *natural* and inviolable right to think, write and propagate everything that pleases him. Created by God, and depending upon Him in every respect, he has not the right to launch forth outrage and blasphemy against the Author of his existence. Becoming a child of the Church by baptism, he has not the right to rise in revolt against his Mother and to fight her. As a member of society he has not the right to strive to sap the foundations upon which society rests. Endowed with free will, enabling him to do what is *good and just meritoriously*, he has not the right to abuse it, and so corrupt the morals of his brethren and bring them to ruin. (See nos. 421-425.) It is equally undeniable that there are errors which are *culpable*. Indeed, there are failings of reason which practically cannot be distinguished from moral perversion. Man is *obliged* above all to adhere to the truth and to preserve his intelligence free from error; this is evident, for in order *to will* it is necessary to know, and to *will justly* it is necessary to know correctly. If there were no rule for *thought* there could not be any rule for action. What would then become of morality and society? A man who tolerates error, knowing it to be error, must be either full of malice or a most despicable character. No mathematician would listen to a false proposition in mathematics, without correcting it; and no good lawyer allows his friends to make a fallacious assumption in a legal matter without telling them of their error. Can we then suppose that a man of integrity, who knows a truth, and knows that he has it from God Himself through the appointed channels of communication, would act as if that truth were no better than fiction? Hence, as we have stated above (430), every Catholic that is sincere, is intolerant, and if he is not intolerant, he is either a hypocrite, or else he does not really

believe what he professes. Among culpable errors, stand foremost the sins of unbelief, heresy and apostacy. In reality, is there any outrage against the honor, the life or the property of a man, a mere creature, which can be compared, as to gravity, with these great crimes, which directly attack the Creator Himself? To refuse *obstinately* to believe in the revelation of God, *sufficiently known as such*, is a crime of High Treason against the Divinity, for it is to deny and impugn in a manner the veracity of God. Now, at the time and in the countries where the Inquisition existed, it was easy for all to have a complete moral certitude (proportionate, however, to the mental condition and development of each man) concerning the divinity of the Christian religion and the truth of the Catholic Church. It would be well to read chapter xxxiv, entitled: "Tolerance in matters of religion," in the excellent work of Balmes, entitled, "Protestantism and Catholicity Compared in their Effects on the Civilization of Europe."

III.—What should be thought of the Proceedings of the Inquisition in General and of the Spanish Inquisition in Particular.

457. We have just proven that the Inquisition was legitimate in principle; and that in the times and countries where it was established, there existed the right to punish those found guilty of propagating religious errors. But should we not severely condemn the manner in which this right was exercised? Was there not cruelty in executing the sentences pronounced against the criminals? This is the question now to be examined. We shall solve it by the aid of a few remarks.

458. First Remark. This question is far from having the same importance as the first. It would be indeed absurd to reproach *the Church* with the abuses, of which the judges of the Inquisition may have been guilty. As we can reasonably impute to a man only the acts and effects which are the result of his personal activity, in the same way we can reproach a social body only with what is the result of its nature and social action, in other words, of its

constitutive principles, of its laws, and the regular exercise of its authority. Who, indeed, would consider himself justified in holding civil law or military rules responsible for abuses of authority committed by the violation of these laws and rules, which the civil and military authority have enacted, and whose transgression they rightly condemn and punish? Now, the abuses which are brought forward against the Inquisition are far from being the result of the principles of Catholicism; they are, on the contrary, radically opposed to its spirit, and, in fact, they have been severely blamed by the Sovereign Pontiffs every time that they were brought to their notice. As history proves, it must be said to the everlasting credit of the Roman Pontiffs, that they never favored the Spanish Inquisition. Leo X. wished to abolish it altogether. Paul III., Pius IV., and Gregory XIII. strenuously opposed its introduction into the Kingdom of Naples, and the Dutchy of Milan, then subject to the Spanish Crown.

From the beginning of the action of the Spanish Inquisition, Pope Sixtus IV. was very ill contented with it, and urged his objections so strongly, that the ambassadors of both courts were ordered to leave their respective stations, and Ferdinand commanded all his subjects to leave Rome. The Pope at last made concessions by the Bull of November 1, 1478. On receiving further accounts of the cruelties done by the Inquisitors of Seville, he retracted the Bull, and ordered that in future the Inquisitors should pass no judgment without the assistance of the Bishops. He further commanded that the Inquisition should not be established in any other province, there being already the ordinary tribunals of the Bishops. When Isabella afterwards desired the withdrawal of the decree which ordered the Bishops, to sit with the Inquisitors, Pope Sixtus IV. courteously, but firmly, refused. The next year, in order to temper the severity of the Inquisition, he appointed Manrique, Archbishop of Seville, as Papal Judge of Appeals, before whom all who thought themselves hardly treated by the Inquisitors, could take their cases. He further gave an appeal

from the Archbishop to himself. The Holy Father thus quashed many prosecutions and softened the punishments in other cases. He, moreover, required that all those who abjured their heresy should be treated with the utmost leniency; and conjured the King and Queen, "by the bowels of mercy in Jesus Christ," to show more tenderness to their subjects — to those even who had unfortunately fallen into error. But King Ferdinand, and afterwards the Emperor Charles V., replied by endeavoring to stop appeals from being carried to Rome.

459. SECOND REMARK. Even if the accusations of wanton cruelty and bloodshed, charged against the Inquisition, were well grounded, this would be no argument against the legitimacy of that tribunal. To prove an abuse of a thing does not prove the necessity of suppressing the lawful use of it: otherwise every human institution or invention would have to be put down, and not even railways, telegraphs and telephones would escape. An institution is deservedly condemned only when the abuses are not *accidental*, but spring *necessarily* from its *essential* character; that is, when the abuse is the effect caused by the institution itself. Apply these considerations to the Roman Inquisition, of which we speak now. The mode of proceeding against accused persons was accurately defined by Bulls of the Popes, and by canon law. No one could even be imprisoned until his guilt had been clearly established before a judicial tribunal. No one could be worried by excessive delays in conducting the trial. There were stringent rules with regard to the character of witnesses, and false testimony was treated with the utmost severity. The judges were ordered never to condemn anyone except on the clearest proofs of guilt, for, as the Pontiffs said, it is better that crime should go unpunished than that even one innocent man should be punished as guilty. Moreover, it must be noted that confession of guilt would at once have exempted the accused from all punishment, or at least have secured so great a mitigation of its rigor, that it ceased to deserve the name. What other tribunal is there, it has been justly asked, where a *plea of*

guilty would be followed by such merciful consequences? We have here a perfect imitation of what actually takes place in the tribunal of penance, where sincere confession of guilt is invariably followed by Sacramental absolution. Behold here how closely the Church, in her legislation, imitates the mercy of her divine Founder! Hence we have reason to conclude that the proceedings of the Inquisition were far more just than those of any judicial court in Europe.

460. THIRD REMARK. We must, moreover, remember that the judges appointed to impose corporal penalties for the crime of heresy were *civil* judges; the office of the ecclesiastical authority being that of establishing the guilt of the accused, a task entirely beyond the competence of the secular rulers. Wherever the tribunal inflicted severe or excessive punishment, death especially, the government was the agent; it is the government, therefore, that must bear the blame, when blame is rightly deserved. (n.458.) Moreover, as we have seen, the State, Christian and Catholic, in lending to the Church the aid of the secular arm, was only fulfilling a duty, that of safe-guarding the sacred rights of conscience and truth, and of protecting from all danger the paramount interests of civil society.

Divine authority and Christian Tradition amply justify secular princes in aiding the Church with their power. Thus the Jewish people were commanded to try, and, after sentence, to stone, any one, whoever he might be, who blasphemed the Lord, or counselled them to apostatize, viz., to depart from the worship of the true God. (See Leviticus, ch. xxiv, v. 14.) St. Augustine (d. A. D. 470) defended, or rather urged the most strenuous measures against the Donatists (furious heretics of the fourth century), in order to repress them. This, he said, is the proper exercise of the power (secular) instituted by God also for the preservation and defense of the Church. His doctrine on this point is tersely expressed in the following sentence of his 93d letter, n. ix: "Serviant reges terrae Christo, etiam leges ferendo pro Christo" (Let Kings serve Christ, by making laws in favor of Christ).

Moreover, *clemency*, which plays so great a part in the judgments of the Inquisition, was *the work of the Church*, who did nothing as to the punishment except to suppress or mitigate them, or to recommend the guilty to the indulgence of the judges. (See the "Life of Ximénes," by Hefele, translated from the German by the Rev. Canon Dalton, ch. 16, 17, 18.) Hence the reputation for mercy which the ecclesiastical tribunals of the Inquisition enjoyed. This reputation was so great, that the Knights Templars expressly begged to be judged by the tribunals of the Eccesiastical Inquisition. They knew well, historians said, that if they secured such judges, they could not be condemned to the penalty of death. But Philip the Fair, who had determined upon their destruction, and who understood the inevitable consequence of a recourse to this tribunal, shut himself up with his Council of State and summarily condemned them to death. And in our day, it was at Rome that the Jews received the best treatment; indeed a proverbial phrase calls the city of the Popes the paradise of the Jews. In Germany, where formerly there were many ecclesiastical sovereignties, there was another proverb, which said: "It is good to live under the Crozier." "Never," says Joseph de Maistre, "under these pacific governments was there a question of persecution or of capital punishment against the spiritual enemies of the reigning power." See Baluffi, "Charity of the Church toward the Jews," ch. xxii.

461. Fourth Remark. It is to give proof of great ignorance of history or of singular hardihood in calumny to represent cruel tortures as the distinctive and exclusive characteristic of the Inquisition. This, however, is what is done every day by anti-religious books, newspapers and reviews.

In reality these tortures were in *universal use*. They were thought necessary to intimidate the guilty. It would even be an easy task to prove that, taking all in all, the tribunals of the Inquisition proved themselves in general *much more equitable and less rigorous* towards the accused than any of the civil tribunals of those times. Héfélé, in

the work already cited, where so many interesting facts concerning the Inquisition of Spain are to be found, has been able to give proof of this even as regards that country, the most exposed to blame, and he has been able to do this even whilst accepting the data of Llorente, the *partial and untrustworthy historian* of the Inquisition.[1]

If the reader desires to form an idea what the tribunals were in the XVI. and XVII. centuries, he should read the learned memoir of M. Poullet, Professor of Jurisprudence at the University of Louvain: *Histoire du droit penal dans le duche de Brabant* (History of penal law in the Duchy of Brabant). We quote these few passages. "In all their procedures there prevailed uncertainty, want of regularity and arbitrary dealings. The accused was deprived of the precious guarantee of publicity as to the proceedings; the judge could, if he pleased, refuse to the accused the assistance of counsel, and the supposed criminal was not allowed to be present at the deposition of testimony." Concerning the penalties in use, the same writer says: "The general system breathed nothing but intimidation and public vengeance. The penalty of death was often accompanied by

[1] It is principally upon the testimony of Llorente that the enemies of the Inquisition ground their charges. To be convinced of the little confidence due to the assertions of Llorente, it is enough to know that after writing his work he was careful to *destroy* the original documents relative to that much maligned institution By so doing he hoped thereby that it would be impossible to verify his assertions and contradict his statements. A little history concerning this individual will not be out of place, as it throws considerable light on our subject. When on May 10, 1808, the victorious advance of Napoleon forced Ferdinand VII. to abdicate the throne of Spain, Llorente repaired to Bayonne, where he turned traitor to his country by swearing allegiance to the usurper of the Spanish crown, Joseph Bonaparte, who made him Counsellor of State, and who ordered him to write a history of the Spanish Inquisition, with a promise of a liberal compensation for his labor. The venal historian knew full well what kind of a work would suit the palate of his master, and he wrote accordingly. Both his patron and the hired compiler had a two-fold object in view, viz.: First, to blacken the character of the Royal dynasty, and thus inspire into the Spanish people hatred and execration of their legitimate sovereigns. Secondly, to fasten on the Papal Court the responsibility of the excessive rigors of a tribunal that, through State interference, had become more political than ecclesiastical in its procedures. Can we put implicit faith in the statements of such an historian, who wrote with the avowed purpose of maligning that institution, and who, as we noticed above, burned the docu-

revolting cruelties, the judges endeavoring to proportion the torments accompanying the death penalty according to the various degrees of criminality in the offenders. After the penalty of death, the law recognized only corporal punishment, often producing irreparable consequences to the victim, always degrading. Nothing was done to reform the criminal and to inspire him with better sentiments before returning him to social life. Imprisonment was only resorted to as a punishment and in cases of minor offenses. It had no place in the penal system properly so-called, and was never ordered, when the judge was about to punish a crime of real gravity."

What has been said of criminal jurisprudence in Brabant applies to the rest of Europe. In those days coiners of false money were burnt alive; those who gave false weights and measures were scourged or were condemned to death; burglars were led to the scaffold; thiefs convicted of a relapse were also condemned to death. A monument of the extreme severity of the civil tribunals was the *Caroline*, the penal code of Charles V., which governed the German Empire *until the last century*.

462. Fifth Remark. When men reproach the recourse to *torture* as a special grievance against the Inquisition, they feign to ignore the fact that this means of discovering the truth was in use in all the tribunals of Europe.

A curious circumstance concerning this subject is related

---

ments, by which he could have been convicted of falsehood? A degraded priest and a venal historian, a dismissed official of the Inquisition and writing for the deliberate purpose of painting it in the most odious colors, he is justly liable to suspicion, whenever his assertions can not be supported by other independent testimony. Yet it is mainly his work which has been the store-house of weapons in the hands of infidels and Protestants against the tribunal of the Inquisition. Prescott, certainly no friend either to the Inquisition or to the Catholic Church (in his history of Ferdinand and Isabella), bears testimony against Llorente's truthfulness in the following words: "One might reasonably distrust Llorente's tables from the facility with which he receives the most improbable estimates in other matters." Yet, strange to say, Prescott himself frequently bases his unmeasured strictures on the Inquisition on the authority of Llorente, the very witness against whose veracity he was honest enough to testify. So much for his reputation of fairness and consistency! (See Balmes, "European Civilization," note in Appendix, p. 457.)

in the memoir of M. Poullet. The Councils of Justice of Belgium were consulted by Charles of Lorraine, in 1765 and 1766, as to projects of reform to be introduced into the criminal law, and particularly as to the advisability of the eventual abolition of torture. *All the Councils demanded its continuance.* A few years afterwards these same Councils were again required to give their opinion as to the employment of torture, for the purpose of eliciting confession from the accused, and all of them repeated their first judgment.

We must also particularly remark that the Inquisition *renounced* the use of torture *long before* the other tribunals of Europe. "It is certain," says Llorente himself, "that for a long time the Inquisition no longer had recourse to torture." Moreover, contrary to the usage of all civil tribunals, the Inquisition did not permit the repeated application of torture during the same trial, and it required that a physician should be present to announce when torture would imperil the life of the patient.

463. SIXTH REMARK. As to the Spanish Inquisition in particular, we have no reluctance to acknowledge that abuses did exist. How could it be otherwise, when there as elsewhere, it was men who were the judges? However, it is important to make here a few special observations.

a. This tribunal was an institution more closely connected with the *State* than with the Church, and its members acted not according to the instructions of the Popes, but according to the orders of the King. As to the abuses, which can be rightfully brought against it, the Church was the first to condemn them. The Popes often protested against excessive severity, and they went so far as to grant to all persons condemned by the royal tribunal, the right to appeal to a special ecclesiastical judge. Later, seeing that the royal judges did not respect this right of appeal, the Sovereign Pontiff granted to all the condemned the right to appeal to the Apostolic See. Some Spanish Inquisitors themselves were even excommunicated, in spite of the anger of the Kings.

The Inquisition had not been in operation more than a

single year before Pope Sixtus IV. (A. D. 1472) entered his most emphatic protest against its cruelty. He wrote to Ferdinand and Isabella that "mercy towards the guilty was more pleasing to God than the severity which they were using." Both he, and his immediate successors in the papal throne, employed their best efforts to check and remedy the abuses of the royal tribunal, and they insisted that the civil status and the property of every accused person should be restored to him when acquitted, or if condemned, that these should revert to his children and relatives.

In a word, the Church exhausted all the influence it possessed to induce the temporal rulers, the kings and the judges, to imitate the mildness and moderation, of which she was herself the example. From all this, is it not absurd and unjust to hold the Papacy and the Church responsible for the excesses committed by the Spanish Inquisitors?

464. **b.** It is proved that the cruelties attributed to the Spanish Inquisition have been *exaggerated beyond measure*, and this with notorious dishonesty and bad faith. Llorente himself, this historian so hostile to the Church (n. 461), acknowledges that the prisons of the Inquisition were dry and high vaulted rooms, that they were palaces compared to the other prisons of Europe. No prisoner of the Inquisition, he assures us, was ever loaded with chains or iron collars. On the other hand, Mr. Bourgoing, ambassador to Spain, does not hesitate to say in his "*Tableaux de l' Espagne moderne*" (Tableaux of Modern Spain): "To render homage to the truth, I must acknowledge that the Inquisition might be cited in our day as a model of equity."

c. What above all makes the less educated people of our day shudder, is the thought of the *autos-da-fé*. They are usually represented as frightful scenes; around an immense fire, lit up to destroy a multitude of victims, are represented a fanatical crowd, and especially the implacable judges of the Holy Office, hastening to contemplate with ferocious delight this spectacle worthy of cannibals.

The truth is that the *auto-da-fé*, that is to say, *the act of faith*, consisted, not in burning or putting to death, but in

proclaiming the *acquittal* of the persons recognized as falsely accused and in reconciling repentant criminals to the Church. For this tribunal, like the tribunal of penance, *absolved those who repented.* After this absolution the *auto-da-fé* ended, and the *ecclesiastical* judges retired. *Obstinate* heretics alone, and those, whose offenses were partly civil, were handed over to the secular arm, to be dealt with according to the gravity of their crime.

465. d. It was question here then of a public profession of faith pronounced by the acquitted prisoner on his being set at liberty. This is the testimony of Llorente, a great enemy, as we have seen, of the Inquisition. That writer speaks of the gross ignorance of some that confounded the *auto-da-fé* (the act of faith) of the acquitted with the punishment of the convicted. Moreover, we must here remark that heresy was a crime, which came under the jurisdiction of the Inquisitors; but it was not the only crime of which they took cognizance. In Spain they were the guardians not only of Catholic Faith, but also of public morals. More than a dozen other offenses were amenable to that tribunal, such as blasphemy, sacrilege, usury, polygamy, treason, and above all, sorcery and magic. The punishment was awarded by the secular judges, not by the Inquisition. Were the punishments severe? It was the laity who apportioned them. The laity, imbued as it was at that time with a genuine Catholic spirit, felt the gravity of an offense against God, and had some care for the honor of God. They did not make light of blasphemy, sacrilege, apostacy, or atheism, as it is done by secular rulers in our day, under the absurd plea of liberty of conscience. They held that an insult to the Supreme Ruler of all nations was an insult to society itself, and they measured the punishment by what they rightly esteemed the gravity of the offense. Hence, as Balmes wisely remarks in his often quoted work (p. 452, n. 26), "the Catholic Religion cannot be held responsible for any of the excesses of the Spanish tribunals; and when men speak of the Inquisition, they ought not to fix their eyes principally on that of Spain, but on that of

Rome acting under the vigilant eye of the Sovereign Pontiffs." In fact, of the Inquisition, as it was in Rome, there are not wanting high authorities to affirm that it has never been known to pronounce a sentence of capital punishment; or, at least, it is unquestionable that such executions were extraordinarily rare. In Spain the Inquisition was severe, because, as we have shown, it was more of a civil and political institution, and because it often acted in opposition to Rome, the part of the world where humanity has suffered the least for the sake of religion.

e. Often the number of the victims of the Spanish Inquisition is stated as being hundreds of thousands, immolated during a short space of time. Now, the figures of Llorente himself give 35,000 as the approximate number of victims for the 331 years during which the Inquisition lasted. And again, in this number are included various categories of *malefactors* properly so called, who were subject to this tribunal, for instance smugglers, magicians or sorcerers, perjurers, usurers, seducers, and other criminals guilty of abominable excesses. Hence it clearly results that the number of those who were executed for willful and obstinate adherence to heretical doctrines was comparatively insignificant, as the greatest portion of victims was made up of criminals, who, down to the commencement of the present century, would have been sentenced to death on conviction in any other tribunal of Europe.

Moreover, even this number is manifestly exaggerated. Thus, if we believe Llorente, at the *auto-da-fé* of Toledo of February 12th, May 1st and December 10th, there were 700, then 900 and 750 accused persons respectively. The truth is that *there was not one single victim*; they were simply repenting criminals brought before the tribunal, and none were put to death. Here, when it is a question of comparing the much decried severity of the Spanish Inquisition with the doings of rulers of other countries, we are of opinion that, on this point at least, Protestant objectors would do well to be silent. Certainly it is not wise for them to provoke a comparison, which, if impartially examined by

the light of reliable historical facts, rather than that of traditional prejudice, will be found to redound to the credit of the Inquisition, and the disgrace of the secular tribunals of their countries. English Protestants in particular should remember the records concerning the use of the rack; of thrusting needles under the nails; of the *Scavenger's Daughter*, a hoop or circle of iron, in which a man's whole body was, as it were, folded up, and his hands, feet and head bound fast together; of the *Little Ease*, a chamber in which a man could neither sit nor stand, nor lie down; and of various other devices of torture, which were used by the Protestant Legislature of England against Catholic Priests. Though it is true that in Protestant countries, such as Germany, Switzerland and England, not to speak of other minor places, there was not and there could not be either the Spanish or the Roman Catholic Inquisition, yet it is not true that there existed in these regions no Inquisition at all. There were indeed in full blast the Protestant Inquisitions of Henry VIII., Queen Elizabeth, of Luther and Melancthon, Calvin and Zwinglius, purposely organized against unoffending Catholics and directed to rob of their very life all who were courageous enough not to allow themselves to be robbed of their faith. To give some statistics, all taken from Protestant authorities, Holinshed puts down the number of those who were butchered during the reign of the grand royal Inquisitor Henry VIII., by the hand of the public executioner, at 72,000; and of his worthy daughter, the *female* Inquisitor Elizabeth, Cobbett does not hesitate to inform his readers that "this sanguinary queen put to death more persons in one year than the Inquisition did during the whole of its duration, 331 years." It would be easy to prove that brutal violence and wholesale slaughter of innocent Catholics signalized the rise and growth of the Reformation in Germany, Switzerland and Southern France, not to speak of Holland, Denmark and Norway, where similar bloody scenes were enacted. (n. 431-438.) Though we have no intention to retaliate, yet in view of the historical documents we have adduced (n. 434-438), we feel justified in advising our Protestant brethren that, as our

Blessed Lord says in His Gospel, "they should first cast the beam out of their own eye before clamoring about the mote in the eye of their neighbor." (Matth. vii, 5.) As the proverb has it, they that live in glass houses should be careful not to throw stones at their neighbor. Then, as we have seen, the intolerance of Protestants has been everywhere much more violent against Catholics, than that of Catholics against heretics. In fact, it was by a most sanguinary persecution that Protestant rulers forcibly snatched the people from their allegiance to the Roman Catholic Church. And yet it is upon the members of this Church alone that some writers cast the blame of bloody persecution against their fellow men!

466. SEVENTH REMARK. It is right to judge a tree by its fruits, and side by side with the odium cast upon the Inquisition, to learn the happy results which it produced. Now it can not be denied that, to a *great extent at least*, it is due to the Inquisition that many countries of Europe have preserved the Faith untainted for centuries, and in particular that they have been saved from the pernicious invasion of intolerant and sanguinary Protestantism. Voltaire, that bitter enemy of the Inquisition and of the Catholic Church, was candid enough to write: "During the 16th and 17th centuries, at the time of the Inquisition, the nation of Spain did not witness in her midst the bloody revolutions, the conspiracies against the throne, and the terrible disasters that desolated the other royal houses of Europe. No king was assassinated as in France, and no royal head was felled by the hand of the executioner as in England." The Spanish Inquisition, notwithstanding all its rigors and excesses, which we freely admit, and the cause of which we have already adduced, can say this much in its defense. The Spanish Government saw all Europe in flames and all hands reeking with blood, wherever heresy and schism arose and the unity of Faith had been lost. The Peasants' War, the Thirty Years' War, the excesses of the Anabaptists; seditions in France; the cruelties that desolated the Netherlands; the wholesale butcheries in England, particularly

under Henry VIII. and Elizabeth; the high handed measures, exiles, confiscations and murders with which the Catholic faith was exterminated, root and branch, from the people of Sweden, Norway and Denmark, taught the other European Catholic nations lessons not to be easily forgotten. The Spanish rulers seeing this, determined to spare Spain these and similar terrors, by preserving, at all costs, the unity of the Faith among that intensely Catholic people, and by stamping out and excluding from the realm even the first germs of the Protestant rebellion, which proselytizing zealots were trying to disseminate in the Spanish Peninsula. The Inquisition was the means devised for the purpose. How can we blame that tribunal for the death and tortures of a few obstinate heretics, when we see that thereby the whole of Spain was saved from interminable civil wars, and all the horrors that characterized the religious fanaticism of the sectarians of Northern Europe?

"Consider," writes Joseph de Maistre, "the Thirty Years' War, lit up by the inflammatory harangues of Luther; the unheard of atrocities of the Anabaptists and Peasants, the civil wars of France, England, Flanders, the massacre of St. Bartholomew, the massacre of Merindol and the Cévennes; the murder of Mary Stuart, Henry III., Henry IV., Charles I., of the Prince of Orange. A ship could float in the blood which the Reformers caused to be shed. Do not tell us that the Inquisition produced this or that abuse; for this is not the question; what is really important is to know if, during the three last centuries, there has been, because of the Inquisition, more peace and happiness in Spain than in the other countries of Europe."

"The Inquisition," as Father Christie wisely remarks, "was the corrective to what we should call Lynch Law. Reflect for a moment what might have resulted from the uncontrollable indignation of the people, Catholic to the backbone, if men were found to blurt out blasphemies against all that such a people held to be holy, and to spread doctrines which would seduce their children, the rising generation, from all that they deemed precious for this life and

the next. What could we expect but tumultuary risings: terrible effects of violence and massacres—Lynch Law with all its horrors? The Tribunal of Faith prevented such consequences. At the outset of the sixteenth century, the Spaniards saw, as it were, the rising smoke, premonitory of a conflagration in Europe. They adopted the Inquisition as the means for preserving religious unity and preventing religious wars. Hence, during the three centuries after the re-organization of the Inquisition, Spain enjoyed more peace and prosperity than any other country in Europe. We have read with horror of the massacre of St. Bartholomew's: what was this massacre? The most satisfactory account would seem to be that without lawful process, under the direction of popular indignation, Lynch Law was executed on the assailants of the faith of Frenchmen. The proceeding was unjustifiable, but it took place because France had no Tribunal of Faith. (n. 474.) Spain itself, before the Tribunal of Faith was set on its efficient footing by Sixtus the Fourth, had its St. Bartholomew in the massacre of the Jews in 1391, in which five thousand Jews perished. If then the very zeal of a people for that which it counts more precious than life itself, is liable to carry the multitude into excesses greatly to be deplored, it is evidently most desirable that a tribunal should exist which should judge cases without prejudice, which should protect the innocent, carry conviction to the mistaken, and punish those only who really deserved punishment."

"A reproach has been made against the Inquisition," says Joseph de Maistre, "that it exercised a blighting influence upon the human mind. Now, the brilliant century of Spanish literature was that of Philip II. . . . It is in vain that men will keep repeating that it is putting fetters on genius to forbid it from attacking dogmas, held by the whole nation; error can never be justified simply because of its repetition." "*Lettre a un gentilhomme sur l' Inquisition Espagnole*" (Letter to a gentleman concerning the Spanish Inquisition).

467. EIGHTH REMARK. Let us make a last remark

that will allay the ridiculous terror, which certain men are pleased to excite. If, as we have seen, the Church has an undeniable right to punish heretics (n. 453), if she did make use of this right when it was proper to do so, she is in nowise obliged to use it always; she must even discontinue to use it, when its exercise would become impossible or hurtful. One thing is the right and quite another thing its exercise. The former rests on justice; the latter depends on prudence, and may vary according to circumstances. And as a matter of fact, the Church has renounced the exercise of this right long ago, so that the Inquisition is now nothing more than an historical *remembrance* and a bugbear in the service of ignorance, bigotry or impiety. They who pretend to tremble at the recollection of this dread tribunal can now sleep in peace; the Catholic sword is no longer suspended over their heads. Would to heaven that in all countries Catholics were equally secure against the attacks of the secular power usually little given to tolerance. To enable our readers to pursue more at length the study of this question, in which we have been comparatively brief, we here append a list of works that will not fail to substantiate all our assertions, and prove agreeable to those who are honest enough to act on the principle "*audi alteram partem*"—hear both sides of the question before you pronounce a definite judgment:

468. 1. Letters on the Spanish Inquisition, by De Maistre. English translation from the French. Boston, 1850.

2. Balmes—European Civilization—work referred to above; ch. 24, 25, 26 and note.

3. The Life of Cardinal Ximenes, by the Rev. Dr. Von Héfélé. Translated from the German. London, 1860; ch. 17, 18.

4. An Historical Sketch of the Order of St. Dominic, by Lacordaire, O. P., New York, 1869.

5. Goschler—Dictionnaire, vol. xi, p. 430-443.

6. Bergier—Dictionnaire, vol. 2.

7. Points of History. Boston; reprinted from the London edition.

8. Kenrick—Primacy of the Apostolic See; p. 424-441.

9. Popular Errors Concerning Politics and Religion. London, 1874, p. 156, by Lord R. Montagu, M. P.

10. Broeckaert, S. J.—The Fact Divine. Portland, Me., 1885; ch. 17.

11. Gibbons—The Faith of Our Fathers. Ch. 18.

12. Taparelli, S. J.—Essay on Natural Right. Note xciii. Rome, 1855.

13. Abbé de Vayrac—L' etat present d'Espagne. Amsterdam, 1719.

14. Baluffi—The Charity of the Church. Dublin, 1885; ch. 21.

15. A Vindication of the Catholic Church, by Archbishop Kenrick; p. 243.

16. Summer School Essays, vol. II—The Spanish Inquisition, by Rev. J. F. Nugent.

17. Abridged Course of Religious Instruction, by Schouppe, S. J.; p. 69.

18. A Brief for the Spanish Inquisition, by Eliza Atkins Stone.

19. Mooted Questions of History, by Humphrey Desmond; p. 218.

20. Some Lies and Errors of History, by Rev. Reuben Parsons; p. 121.

21. Modern History, by Fredet; note, p. 518.

22. The Tribunal of Faith—The Inquisition, article by Albany Jones Christie, S. J.; Month, vol. 49, p. 82.

23. Le Menzogne Nella Storia (Historical Lies).

24. Dictionnaire Apologetique, by J. Jaugey; vol. 1, p. 1525.

25. Brownson's Works, vols. 6, 10, 12, 13.

26. Catholic Controversy. A reply to Dr. Littledale's Plain Reasons, by H. S. D. Ryder of the Oratory; p. 209.

27. Catholic Dictionary, p. 446–448.

28. Ecclesiastical Dictionary, p. 361–362.

29. Manual of Universal Church History, by Dr. J. Alzog; p. 979–987.

30. Devos, The Three Ages of Progress, p.p. 165, 170, 235, 246.

31. Guggenberger, S. J.—A General History of the Christian Era, vol. II, p. 120-126. The Reader will find in this work a very able though condensed treatment of the whole question.

§ IV. The Process of Galileo.

469. The condemnation of Galileo is also a weapon frequently employed by the enemies of the Church. It is because, in their eyes, this condemnation disproves at the same time the *infallibility* of the Pope, and demonstrates the opposition of the Church to the progress of science. Let us see if these accusations are well founded.

470. Historical Notice. Galileo (A. D. 1564-1642), a learned astronomer and distinguished philosopher, born at Pisa, but by his residence belonging to Florence, adopted, at the beginning the XVII. century the opinion of Copernicus (A. D. 1473–1545), a Canon of the Church, who taught the immobility of the sun and the rotation of the earth. Whilst Copernicus could teach this theory without being molested, Galileo was, on the 24th of February, 1616, attainted by the censure of the Holy Office. No book of Galileo was condemned, but the doctrine of Copernicus which he was defending, as to the diurnal motion of the earth on its axis and the immobility of the sun, was declared false in philosophy, contrary to Holy Writ and formally heretical. However, this censure was a *secret* act, and compromised only the Consulters of the Roman Congregation, for whose decision no infallibility was ever claimed. Accordingly no discussion arose concerning this view of the censure. The following Thursday, on the report of the Cardinals of the Holy Office, the Pope ordered that this censure should be notified to Galileo and that he be forbidden to teach the doctrine of the motion of the earth. The order, however, does not contain *a single word* of Paul V, by which this doctrine is characterized; moreover, we must remark, this is a secret document, having nothing in

common with an *ex-cathedra* definition. (See nos. 384-387.) Then came a decree of the Index, dated the 5th of March, 1616, which prohibited books *written* in favor of the Copernican system. As to Galileo, he has never been subjected to any corporal penance. He continued to reside in his villa near Florence, enjoying the friendship and favors of Urban VIII. Finally, in 1633, judgment was rendered condemning Galileo to retract the teaching which was then judged to be erroneous. It establishes simply the guilt of Galileo, and fixes the spiritual penalties, which he was to undergo. The decree of 1616 is only recalled as *a historical fact.* "The Sacred Congregation of the Index," it states, "has rendered a decree wherein books maintaining this doctrine are prohibited and the doctrine itself is declared *false* and contrary to the Sacred Scriptures." There is here no trace of a public and official intervention of the Sovereign Pontiff in his capacity of Supreme Pastor, either in the pronouncing of heresy against the Copernican system, or in the examination and condemnation of Galileo.

It results from the account that the only important decree from the *doctrinal* point of view is that of the 5th of March, 1616, because it attributes to the biblical text a meaning, which as we now know, this text does not bear. Let us now see what we must think of this decree, and solve two questions closely connected with it.

I.—The Error Contained in the Decree of 1616 Proves Nothing Against the Infallibility of the Church or Against the Infallibility of the Pope.

471. The proof of this is as plain as it is peremptory. The decree of 1616 is not one of those judgments to which the Church attributes the privilege of infallibility. For:

1. We have previously seen (n. 387) the conditions necessary in order that the doctrinal teachings of the Sovereign Pontiff should enjoy the privilege of infallibility. It is necessary that the Pope should speak *ex-cathedra*, that is in the discharge of his office as Supreme Pastor and teacher of all Christians, by virtue of his supreme apostolic authority; a that he should decree that a doctrine concerning

faith or morals defined by him must be believed by the whole Church. Now the decree of 1616 alleged by our opponents is wanting in the characteristics required by the Vatican Council. In a word, no doctrine is imposed upon the belief of the whole Church; it is only a *disciplinary measure*, to prevent the diffusion of certain books. It is quite true that *the preamble* which precedes the decree, and makes known the motive that dictated it, contains a doctrinal error; for the theory of the diurnal motion of the earth on its axis is neither false nor contrary to Scripture; but the decision itself is simply a disciplinary judgment emanating from a fallible body. It was the erroneous decision of a fallible tribunal. But, it may be asked, did not the Roman Pontiff confirm the decree by some official public act or definition, binding on all the Faithful and thereby make it his own? The Encyclopedia Brittanica, which represents the conclusions of educated English opinion, shall answer this question: "This edict, it is essential to observe, of which the responsibility rests, with a disciplinary congregation, in no sense representing the Church, was never confirmed by the Pope, and was virtually repealed in 1757."

2. To this decisive proof let us add that the *form itself* of the decree fully confirms what we say. In all doctrinal definitions emanating from the Holy See, and acknowledged as infallible, it is always the *Pope* who teaches *directly* and not by the intermediary voice of the Cardinals. No instance can be cited of a doctrinal decision generally recognized as infallible, that was rendered in the form of the decree concerning Galileo.

3. There is another argument of great force: contemporary documents prove that the Pope himself and the dignitaries of his court *never considered* this decree as an infallible definition. The same thing may be said of the theologians of that period and of those who followed; none can be cited who considered this decree as a final and infallible decision. We could, on the contrary, name a great number who positively hold the contrary. Their names and opin-

ions may be found in the works and articles of M. Gilbert or in the *Dictionnaire Apologetique* (Apologetic Dictionary) of the Abbé Jaugey, article *Galileo*, vol. 1, p. 1315. Finally the idea of seeing in this decree an *ex-cathedra* definition did not occur even to the most bitter *enemies* of Galileo, who would have found in such a definition the best weapon to strike a decisive blow against his theories.

4. A dogmatic definition can never be reversed, yet from the very beginning contemporaries looked on this decree as reformable. In fact, in 1752, the decree of 1616 against teaching Copernicanism was revoked, and the books referring to it were expunged from the catalogue of forbidden books. The Jesuit Cardinal Bellarmine, a contemporary and special friend and adviser of Galileo, writes, in his letter to Foscarini, that "should satisfactory proofs be adduced (and such proofs as yet had not been adduced) of the earth's rotary motion, he is quite prepared to change his views as to the meaning of the Scripture texts referring to this point. The Jesuit astronomer Grossi, in 1623, remarked: "When a scientific demonstration of the earth's movement shall be brought forward, it will then be fitting to interpret Scripture otherwise than has hitherto been done." (n. 157.) Galileo's case, then, evidently had no bearing on Papal infallibility, a conclusion which we are glad to be able to support by a quotation from a Protestant writer, the late Mr. Proctor, the eminent astronomer, the learned mathematician, and the distinguished editor of several scientific publications: "Quite incorrect," he says, "is the idea that Papal infallibility is disproved by the decision against Galileo. The Catholic doctrine on the subject of Papal infallibility is perfectly definite; and it is absolutely certain that the decision in regard to Galileo's teaching, shown now to have been unsound, does not in the slightest degree affect that doctrine. The decision was neither *ex-cathedra*, nor addressed to the whole Church." Mr. Mallock, another Protestant writer of repute, in his well known book "Is Life Worth Living?" (ch. xii), observes: "This claim to infallibility is one, as we shall see when we understand its nature, that no study

of ecclesiastical history can invalidate now, or can even promise to invalidate."

472. REMARK. 1. We have no hesitation in acknowledging that the condemnations pronounced against the Florentine astronomer, are to be deeply regretted, and that in issuing them, the Roman Congregations erred. They were in the wrong in believing that Catholic Faith was endangered and the Holy Scripture contradicted by the Copernican system. In this they allowed themselves to be led astray by their excessive infatuation for Aristotle, and for the philosophical systems of his commentators, which were diametrically opposed to the Copernican theory. As to the part that Pope Urban VIII. may have taken in this transaction, his responsibility is altogether individual, absolutely personal; it concerns him simply as a private theologian, but not as the Sovereign Pontiff, *speaking ex-cathedra*, that is, addressing his teaching to the Universal Church, to be believed and held by all as revealed truth under pain of sin.

2. Though the system of Copernicus was true, Galileo did not know how to defend it, and there is nothing strange that the feeble proofs, by which he tried to support it, should have met with ardent opponents. There are, no doubt, some extenuating circumstances in the fact of Galileo's condemnation by the Holy Office of the Inquisition, which, if they do not entirely justify its action in the matter at issue, must, at least, afford to it some excuse. In fact, Galileo had not succeeded in bringing satisfactory proofs of the Copernican system, which he advocated so tenaciously. His conclusions were only happy and lucky guesses. Nay, not only was his reasoning from the flux and reflux of the tides wrong, and therefore failing to demonstrate the Copernican theory, but when a scientist greater than himself, Kepler, pointed out the true explanation of the tides, Galileo, instead of admitting his error, treated that explanation, which, even in our day, is held by the scientific world as the true one, with supreme contempt. As a matter of fact, the first strong mathematical proof of the truth of Copernicanism is found in the Principia of Newton, published in 1687, that

is seventy-one years after the issue of the Index decree. After Newton came the astronomer Bradley (1727), with his discovery of the aberration of light as it travels from the distant stars to the earth, moving on in its orbit around the sun. This might be called a tangible, physical proof of the Copernican or heliocentric system, which holds that the sun is immovable, the center of the planetary system, and that our earth revolves on its axis every twenty-four hours, and thus produces the succession of day and night. In our own day, Foucault has made visible the diurnal motion of the earth by his well-known pendulum experiment. As the illustrious Jesuit writer Tiraboschi judiciously remarks in his History of Italian Literature: "In this we must admire the Providence of God in behalf of His Church. For at a time when the majority of theologians firmly believed the system of Copernicus to be contrary to holy Scripture, and nearly the whole scientific world held the Ptolemaic explanation of the motion of the heavenly bodies as true, while Galileo himself was unable to demonstrate the truth of the Copernican theory, God did not permit His Church to pronounce a solemn *ex-cathedra* judgment against a system which is now believed by all to be true." In this connection let me call the reader's attention to the following remark. During the long lapse of nineteen centuries, in a long list of 258 Popes, the enemies of Papal Infallibility think they have discovered three instances—one instance for each six hundred years, one instance for each set of eighty-six Popes —where a Pope as Pope has officially erred in his dogmatic teaching. Three instances they claimed to have discovered, that of Pope Liberius (A. D. 352); that of Pope Honorius (A. D. 625), and lastly the case of Galileo, involving two Pontiffs, Urban VIII. and Innocent X. Yet when we subject these three instances to the searching criticism of accurate history and precise theology, we find that even in these three cases the attack of our enemies falls ignominiously to the ground. The Church can never err in faith, for she is the pillar and ground of the truth. (I. Tim iii, 15.) The Pope as Pope can never err in faith, for he is that rock, against which the gates of hell shall never prevail. Moreover, if

the ecclesiastical tribunals were wrong, *the learned* had no reason to boast, for they also in great numbers fell into the same error, and desired and promoted much more vehemently than any of the clerics the condemnation of the new system. If theology is to be condemned on this account, science is none the less to be blamed. Secchi, the Jesuit astronomer, tells us that "none of the real proofs of the earth's rotation upon its axis were known at the time of Galileo. Not until Reamur (d. 1757) had ascertained the velocity of light, and Newton (d. 1729) the law of gravitation, was the scientific truth of the system established on a solid basis. Bacon in England, Descartes in France, Tycho Brahe in Germany, and all the universities of Europe were contemporaneously skeptical of and prejudiced against Copernicanism equally with the conscientious Biblical scholars who made up the Roman Inquisition."

3. Here we cannot help remarking that Luther, Melancthon, Calvin and, in general, all the leaders of the so-called Reformation have not shown, after all, a better regard for the new Copernican system. Luther used to call Copernicus *a madman*, because, according to him, he attempted to upset all the science of astronomy, though, according to the Scriptures, said the reformer, Joshua stopped the sun and not the earth. Kepler, a Lutheran minister, and distinguished astronomer, held the Copernican theory, and wrote a book to demonstrate its truth. Before this work could be printed, it was necessary to lay it before the Academical Senate of the University of Tübingen. How was it received? The unanimous decision of the Protestant divines composing this Senate was that the book contained a *damnable heresy*, because it contradicted the teaching of the Bible! Kepler was consequently obliged to flee his country, and where did he find refuge? First in the Jesuit College of Gratz in Austria, and after as Professor of Astronomy, Lutheran as he was, in the Catholic University of Bologna, a most honorable position assigned to him by the Pope! In view of these historical facts we may be allowed to conclude that, if the condemnation of Galileo, in the mind of

our adversaries, proves the hostility of Catholicity to secular and scientific knowledge, the condemnation of Kepler, followed by his exile, proves just the same against Protestantism. But, as far as the Catholic Church is concerned, we shall soon see in the following pages that no fair minded historian can allege Galileo's case as a proof of her opposition to true progress and enlightenment in any field of human knowledge.

4. If Galileo, after the decree of 1616, had kept his promise, and had been more circumspect and reserved, he would not have been subjected to the condemnation of 1633, and it may be considered probable that it would not have taken long for the Copernican system to become popular, for it had as partisans and defenders among members of the clergy, a considerable number of the most celebrated men of learning of the time, though, as we have seen, they were unable to furnish apodictic proofs. Unfortunately, Galileo did not have the patience to wait for the time when he might see the inevitable triumph of his ideas. Though he had bound himself not to maintain the Copernican system, he wrote a new book, *Dialogues about the Two Systems of the World*, in which he exhibited the bad taste of attacking those among his opponents who had shown the greatest kindness to him. The Pope in particular thought that he was designated in these dialogues by the ridiculous character Simplicio. Stung to the quick, the partisans of the Ptolemaic system demanded and obtained the condemnation of 1633.

5. At the beginning of this discussion (n. 469) we stated that whilst the astronomer Copernicus had been teaching his theory in Rome itself without molestation, Galileo, on the contrary, was severely censured by the theologians of the Holy Office for advocating the same system. It is well to point out the reasons of these different proceedings on the part of the Roman authorities, which we find very ably stated both in Brownson's Works, vol. 6, p. 543-547, and in "Popular Errors," by Lord Robert Montagu, p. 174-180. What then are the real facts in the case? It appears that Galileo, by the manner in which he proclaimed his theory,

his intemperate language in advocating it, and his attempt to reconcile it with the Scriptures, aroused the anger of many of his enemies, and was the cause of all his troubles. He was repeatedly advised to speak as a mathematician, to confine himself to the scientific proofs of his discoveries without meddling with the Scriptural question. But with this Galileo was not satisfied. He insisted on two things—first, that his doctrine was scientifically demonstrated, and second, that it was supported by Scripture. But the Inquisitors, before whose tribunal the case was brought, decided against him; first, that the doctrine was not demonstrated, and secondly, that it was not supported by Holy Scripture. Hence, it was again asked of him that he should be content to teach his doctrine as an hypothesis, not as a doctrine fully and satisfactorily demonstrated, and should confine himself to mathematical and astronomical arguments, without meddling with the Scriptural bearings of the doctrine. Had he been content to pursue a straightforward course, as a scientific man, no complaint would ever have been entertained against him, and no official action would ever have been taken. His troubles then all arose from his rashness, from his insisting that the Roman authorities should sanction as demonstrated what was as yet only a probable hypothesis. The sole difficulty then, concerning the great question at issue, grew out of Galileo's insisting on interpreting the passages of Scripture, which seem to teach the geocentric theory—the immobility of the earth—so as to make them harmonize with the heliocentric, the immobility of the sun. The Roman theologians said to Galileo: "Go and establish your theory on scientific grounds, and when you have succeeded in demonstrating it as a science, it will be time enough to consider the Scriptural question; but till then let the Scriptural question alone." Had he followed this advice, which was recommended by his friends, and particularly by Cardinal Bellarmine, no difficulty would have occurred. But Galileo imprudently, and to the injury of his cause, abandoned the scientific grounds and defended himself by inventing new and dangerous rules of interpretation of Holy Writ, so as to get rid of those passages

of the Bible, which had been alleged against him; and he went so far as to say that the mode of interpretation of the Scriptures had until that time been fallacious. Hence, instead of striving to prove the truth of the earth's rotary motion on scientific grounds, he drew arguments against his judges and rivals out of the books of Job and Joshua, losing himself at last in a perfect maze of theological subtleties, and all this absurd matter is contained in his own manuscripts still preserved.

"We may fairly presume that the strongest text of Holy Scripture, if not the only one, opposed, at least apparently, to the Copernican-Galileo system, is found in the Book of Josue, x, 12-14:

> Then Josue spoke to the Lord, in the day that he delivered the Amorrhite in the sight of the children of Israel, and he said before them: Move not, O sun towards Gabaon, nor thou, O moon, towards the valley of Ajalon. And the sun and moon stood still, till the people revenged themselves of their enemies. Is not this written in the book of the just? So the sun stood still in the midst of the heaven, and hasted not to go down the space of one day. There was not before nor after so long a day, the Lord obeying the voice of a man, and fighting for Israel.

Of course the strength of the objection is that not only Josue prayed with the belief that the sun and not the earth really moved, but that God so received his prayer that the Holy Ghost declares that the sun was arrested in his course and *stood still.*

Now a little reflection will reveal why God appears to connive at an astronomical misconception. Josue immediately followed Moses in the years A. M. 2553 and B. C. 1451. The history of the Jewish people, while under Josue, is commonly believed to have been written by Josue himself. The common belief then was, as it had been from the earliest times and as it remained practically till the seventeenth century of the Christian era, that the earth was the *centre* of the Universe, and that the sun was always in motion and truly rose in the morning and set in the evening. Even to this day we talk of the sun "rising" in the east and "setting" in the west. (n. 157.)

Now in the face of this universal belief (even were you to suppose Josue by inspiration knew better), what would the people have thought of Josue, if he had ordered the earth (which they regarded as immovable) and not the sun (which they regarded as always moving) to stand still? They would have laughed him to scorn or thought he had lost his senses. And God knew that; and so he dissimulated the physical inaccuracy, in order that the miraculous fact might become, at least, intelligible to the people.

The old Ptolemaic system, which placed our earth immovable in the centre and supposed the sun and moon and stars to revolve around it every twenty-four hours, was not only the universally received system, but, it may be said, the only popular one, best adapted to vulgar capacities and the freest from palpable difficulties, when science was still in its infancy, and the most consistent with common appearances and observations. The gross Israelites were so used to it that, had Moses, Josue, or any other inspired leader known anything of the heliocentric truth, yet it would have been improper, if not dangerous, to have so much as hinted at it. *How* God worked the miracle is beyond the necessary scope of this essay."—*Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, Nov. 1902.

Hence, to return to our subject, as far as Galileo's defence went, his theory of the motion of the earth was no more than an hypothesis. It had no astronomical support. He made it rest on theological grounds, starting from new canons or rules in the interpretation of Scriptures. As these assumptions were not granted, his case necessarily fell to the ground. Could the Holy Office then be blamed for refusing to accept metaphorical interpretations of some passages of Scriptures, when there appeared no reason for abandoning the literal meaning, Galileo's theory being unsupported by evidence? In conclusion, if Galileo had been content to let theology alone, and to advance his theory simply as an astronomical hypothesis, the Holy Office would not have concerned itself with him any more than it did with Cardinal di Cusa and Copernicus. Still less would he have been hindered from working out reasonable proofs on astronom-

ical grounds or of purely astronomical truth. When this was done in later years, the Church did not utter a word of opposition.

6. Let us add a useful remark concerning the Roman Congregations. They are subject to error, no doubt; but this does not mean that they have no authority and that their decrees can be disregarded. The father of a family may likewise in some cases be in the wrong, but he does not thereby lose the right to the obedience of his children. Established for the purpose of examining doctrinal questions and seeing to the preservation of Faith in its purity, these Congregations have the legitimate power to enact obligatory measures of discipline, *to interdict the teaching* of certain doctrines considered by them as erroneous, suspicious or dangerous. Such a prohibition is *a measure of prudence and has a force of law*; however, it is essentially *provisional* in its nature. Hence, if it be subsequently established that the danger does no longer exist, the prohibition is by that very fact removed or ceases of itself, by default of an object to justify its enforcement, for such decisions, far from being dogmatic definitions, are simply disciplinary canons or measures naturally subject to change.

Conclusion. Therefore it evidently follows that the infallibility of the Church and of the Sovereign Pontiff are absolutely foreign to this question. There is reason, on the contrary, as we have already observed, to acknowledge the providential assistance assured to the Church at a time when a number of theologians and the Pope himself thought the system of Copernicus contrary to the Sacred Scriptures, but God did not permit that the Sovereign Pontiff should issue a judgment *ex-cathedra* against it.

II.—Is the Church Opposed to Scientific Progress, and was Galileo a Martyr to Science?

473. This question is much less important than the first. We shall therefore content ourselves with rapidly indicating the answer.

1. Far from being opposed to the progress of science,

the Church has *always* encouraged intellectual activity; she has always favored the study and cultivation of philosophy, literature, science and the fine arts. We have already proven this (n. 141), and we shall again do so in Chapter V.

As to the special fact of a supposed systematic and malicious opposition to the progress of natural science, attributed to members of the higher clergy *at the time of Galileo*, it is openly contradicted by the shining proofs of sympathy and protection which scientific studies were then receiving at Rome; by the remarkable works of the Jesuits Clavius, Griemberger, Guldin, Scheiner, Grimaldi, Riccioli; of Canons, or members of religious orders, such as Copernicus, Castelli, Renieri, Cavalieri, Gassendi; by the enthusiastic reception given in the highest circles of the learned at Rome to the discoveries of Galileo; by his intimacy and active correspondence with a great number of prelates, such as Cardinals Barberini and Canti, Mgr. Dini, Mgr. Ciampoli, Archbishop Piccolomini, Mgr. Virginio Césarini.

Moreover, the system of Aristarchus of Samos, (d. 150, B. C.) who taught that the earth moved around itself, whilst the sun remained immovable, was freely taught long previously,without the Church ever making any objection thereto. In 1435 Cardinal de Cusa revived this system; Canon Copernicus, in his immortal work *De orbium celestium revolutionibus* (The revolution of the celestial orbs), had completed its exposition; his work had gained the support of Cardinal Schönberg and the approbation of Pope Paul III., who had accepted its dedication to himself; the new doctrine was taught in the Italian Universities and publicly professed in the presence of the Sovereign Pontiff Clement VII., and no official or authorized protest against such teaching was ever heard within the Church before Galileo's time.

2. In order to arouse more violently anti-religious hatred, attempts have been made to represent Galileo as a martyr to science, thrown into a dark dungeon and given up to the horrors of torture. The truth is that from 1616

to 1633 he peaceably continued his labors in his villa near Florence, writing the works we have mentioned. As to the second process against him, it is proven by the testimony of his contemporaries, the most worthy of belief, and by the correspondence of Galileo himself, and the official report of 1633, that not only Galileo was not made a martyr, but that, properly speaking, he was never imprisoned, neither before nor after judgment. "We may challenge the fanatical enemies of the Church," says Gilbert in *La Revue des Questions Scientifiques* (Review of Scientific Questions), 1877, "to cite when and where, either before or after his condemnation, Galileo was subjected even to one hour's detention in a prison, properly so called." Whilst the prosecution was going on, he inhabited the palace of Nicolini, Ambassador of Tuscany and his devoted friend, who showered the kindest attentions upon him; then, on the eve of his trial, he was brought to the Minerva, where he remained from the 12th to the 30th of April, 1633, in the apartments of the fiscal Procurator of the Holy Office, with liberty to walk about at pleasure in the gardens attiguous to that residence, "to wander through its vast extent," as Galileo himself writes; and in this residence he was waited upon by his own servant and by those of the Ambassador. "As to my health, I am well, thanks to God and to the exquisite attentions of the Ambassador and his lady, who are most anxious to procure for me the greatest comfort." Having fallen ill, he was brought back, by the orders of Urban VIII., to the palace of the Ambassador, where he could receive all his friends and was permitted to go out as he pleased. He remained in this brilliant *dungeon* (sic) until the 22d of June, the day of his condemnation. The sentence ordered that he be detained in the apartments of the Treasurer of the Holy Office, but the very next day this sentence was commuted to retirement in the palace of the Grand Duke of Tuscany; then, after a short stay with his devoted friend, the Archbishop of Siena, he passed the remainder of his life in his villa at Arcetri, near Florence, where he continued his scientific studies and received the visits of the learned and of the great personages of his time. He received a life-pension

from the Papal treasury, and died, as he had lived, a very religious man, in the year 1642. His mortal spoils rest in the magnificent Basilica of Santa Croce, in Florence, adorned with a monument worthy of his genius.

3. As to the torture, which, some pretend, was inflicted upon the illustrious astronomer, it is nowhere mentioned in the authentic records of the whole process, published in their entirety by M. de l' Epinois, records which relate all the proceedings, even in their minutest details. "Never," says this writer, "did Galileo in his most confidential correspondence, write a single line from which it could be inferred that he was subjected to torture. It is true that at the last interrogatory, he was threatened with torture, but it is equally certain that this threat was and could be nothing more than a simple formality." And in fact, as it has been just stated, the threat was never carried out, and this especially because the inquisitorial procedure did not permit of torture being resorted to in the case of old men and infirm people. Now, Galileo was then fifty-nine years of age, and suffering from a serious infirmity. Moreover, he himself declares, in a letter dated 1634, that he suffered nothing, either in his person or his honor. (See Gilbert, in the article cited above.)

It was only about the year 1770, that is, nearly 140 years after the process, that some Italian writers, hostile to the Church, began to spread the report that Galileo had been put to the torture, though even they declared the fact to be unlikely. Now that we possess the official documents, this calumny has become absolutely untenable; it has in consequence been abandoned by all serious writers, no matter to what party they may belong. However, this can scarcely lead us to hope to see it disappear from writings hostile to religion, inspired by Voltaire's principle: "Be not afraid to utter lies, some of them will stick in the end."

Let us also remark in passing that the famous words: "*e pur si mouve*" (and yet she (the earth) does move), ascribed to Galileo at the moment that he rose from his abjuration, appears absolutely improbable to those who have studied the proceedings. It was first invented at the end of the 18th

century, as has been shown by the mathematician Heis in the periodical "*Gaea*," year 1868. Yet a class of writers will continue to palm off the incident as true, because it is likely to produce a fine effect in a novel or in a theatrical scene, where men will look in vain for anything like honest historical truth.

474. CONCLUSION. The enemies of the Church must indeed be at a loss for arguments against her, since they constantly return, in spite of repeated refutations, to rehash their account of an error committed centuries ago by an ecclesiastical tribunal, which never claimed the privilege of infallibility. Have our civil tribunals, and even the Supreme Court of the United States, never committed any blunders? This error, the only one of its kind, was, however, common, as we have noticed, to a great number of learned men of that time, and was quite natural at the epoch when it occurred. The obstinate persistency of the adversaries of the Church in having recourse to this affair, now more than two hundred years old, as a powerful weapon against Catholicity, is all the more strange in as much that Galileo himself was neither a rebel nor a free-thinker. He was a staunch, sincere Catholic, fully convinced of the truth of his Faith; the hardest trials did not in the least weaken his religious belief, and he died piously in the bosom of the Catholic Church.

475. References: 1. Henri de l' Epinois—Les Pieces du Procés de Galilée, Paris, Palmé, 1877. A standard work, containing a full reproduction of the famous process, taken from the archives of the Holy Office, thrown open to the public by His Holiness Leo XIII.

2. N. P. Grisar, S. J.—Galilei Studien, Ratisbonne; Pustet, 1878.

3. Jaugey—Dictionnaire Apologetique de la Foi Catholique; Paris, Delhomme et Briguet, 1889. Two volumes. The Rev. writer of this Dictionary, in his article on Galileo, vol. 1, p. 1315–1366, presents to his readers one of the most exhaustive and ablest discussions on the subject, based on the original records of the Holy Office.

4. F. N. Wegg Prosser—Galileo and his Judges; London, Chapman & Hall, 1889.

5. Le Menzogne Nella Storia (Historical Lies), p. 328–342.

6. H. J. Desmond—Mooted Questions of History; Boston, Marlier & Co., 1901; p. 285–296.

7. Lord Robert Montagu—Popular Errors; p. 174-181; London, Burns & Oates, 1874.

8. Cardinal Gibbons—The Faith of our Fathers; p. 296–299.

9. Ryder, of the Oratory—Catholic Controversy, Answer to Dr. Littledale; p. 33 and 260; New York, Christian Press Publishing Co.

10. Rev. R. Parsons—Some Lies and Errors of History; p. 80–104; Notre Dame, Indiana, 1892.

11. Rev. R. Parsons—Studies in Church History; vol. 4, p. 81–108.

12. Fredet—Modern History; p. 522.

13. Right Rev. P. Kenrick—The Primacy of the Apostolic See Vindicated; p. 472–475.

14. Points of History; 185–225. Compiled from the Dublin Review for July, 1838, and the Rambler for January, 1852.

15. Civiltá Cattolica; vol. 3, p. 166. A review of the classical work of Mgr. Marino Marini on Galileo and the Inquisition. Rome, 1850.

16. Catholic Dictionary, by Addis and Arnold; New York, Catholic Publication Society, 1884. Article "Galileo," p. 361–366.

17. Guggenberger—General History of the Christian Era; vol. 2, p. 456.

REV. JAMES J. GALLAGHER.

§ V. The Massacre on the Eve of St. Bartholomew's Day.

476. HISTORICAL ACCOUNT. In 1572, on the night preceding the feast of St. Bartholomew, August 24th, Charles IX., yielding to the solicitations of *Catherine de Medici*, his mother, gave orders to massacre in Paris Admiral Coligny and the other principal leaders of the Hugue-

nots residing in that city, or who had lately arrived to attend the marriage of the king of Navarre with Margaret de Valois. The Parisian populace had for a long time borne intense hatred against the Huguenots; it had not forgotten the pillaging of the capital which the reformed leaders had promised to the mercenary troops recruited in Germany. Hence, once inflamed with fury at the sight of blood shed during that terrible night by the emissaries of the king, it arose in its turn, sought out the Huguenots and fell upon them, without anyone having sufficient authority to stop the carnage. From the 25th of August until the 30th of October, similar massacres were perpetrated in several other cities of the kingdom. We are not surprised that under the strain of terrible provocation on the part of the Huguenots, this lamentable instance of cruel retaliation should have occurred.

Religion had no Part Whatever in the Massacre.

477. It is not for us to examine this event from *the political point of view*. It will be found treated of with great care in the excellent work of Kervyn de Lettenhove, *Les Huguenots et les Gueux* (The Huguenots and the Beggars). The minute researches of this writer, who advances nothing without citing documents to substantiate his assertions, throw abundant light upon this mournful drama. Our duty is to establish the fact that the Catholic religion has been made responsible for these massacres without a shred of proof to justify the foul charge. If there is in the whole range of history anything shown most clearly by the most incontestable documentary evidence it is that *the massacre of St. Bartholomew was a purely political event and that religion had no part in it, either as a pretext, or as adviser or as agent.* No cardinal, no bishop, no priest took any part in the deliberations, at which the massacre was decided upon, no more than in its execution. The author of Annales Politiques (Political Annals) testifies that no ecclesiastic was in the Council of the king or in the least cognizant of the contemplated massacre. He also asserts that it was from beginning to end a merely political expedient. In the face

of such testimony, how, with any show of justice, can any blame be insinuated against the Church? On the contrary, undeniable records prove that the Church interfered to save the victims. The Bishop of Lisieux, for instance, succeeded in arresting the massacre, which had begun in his diocese; at Lyons the Archbishop opened his palace as a refuge to more than 300 Calvinists; and at Toulouse, Bordeaux, Bourges and other cities, the bishops and other ecclesiastics succeeded in their indefatigable efforts to save many persons from the effects of the king's orders and from the fury of the populace.

It is true that at the news of the terrible *coup d'Etat*, Gregory XIII. ordered solemn thanks to God, that he went himself in procession from the Church of St. Mark to that of St. Louis of the French and caused a commemorative medal to be struck. But we now know perfectly well what was the true and sole purpose of those demonstrations. The Court of the Valois had officially informed the Pope, that a conspiracy directed against the throne and life of Charles IX. had happily been discovered and stamped out. A similar notification was sent to the different provinces of the kingdom and to all the courts of Christendom. Therefore the "Te Deum" was sung in the French Church at Rome, under French auspices, as an act of international comity in consequence of the first report. Those were not the days of telegraphy and telephones. Later on, the truth became known in all its details, and the Sovereign Pontiff in his discourses and by his Bulls, publicly expressed his horror at the crime.

We cannot hope, however, to see the enemies of the Church change their tactics. In spite of repeated refutations made even by learned Protestant historians they will continue to ascribe to religious hatred the vengeance perpetrated by the ministers of Catherine de Medici, and the better to excite passionate feelings, they will persist, with Voltaire and a celebrated modern opera, to mingle together the crucifix and the dagger, and point out the Cardinal Charles de Lorraine, who at that time was *in Rome*, in the act of

blessing *in Paris* the daggers destined for the massacre.

478. REMARKS. 1. It would perhaps not be a useless task to show that *the number of the victims* of the massacre has been grossly *exaggerated*. It is impossible to know the whole truth in that regard; accordingly the number varies with each historian; it has, however, been established with a considerable degree of probability that the number was not over 2,000. Cardinal Hergenrother, whose authority as a writer it is difficult to challenge, puts it between two and three thousand at most. This is an enormous number, no doubt, but it is far from the 30,000 victims spoken of by some authors and especially from the 100,000 boldly asserted by Péréfixe. What confidence indeed can be placed in historical accounts when at every step palpable contradictions are met with? The martyrology of the Calvinists, published by the sect in 1582, speaks of 15,168 victims, but it names only 786; and yet it was evidently the author's interest to increase the number if he had been able to do it with impunity. Moreover, he wrote at a time when the impression of the awful crime was yet vivid and its memory fresh; and as he collects names of very little importance, it may easily be believed that he has forgotten nothing, and has gathered together everything to swell the number of his so-called martyrs and the volume of the martyrology.

2. Let us further remark that it has not been at all proved that the massacre was *long premeditated*; he contrary even seems to be well established. The following few words sum up the opinion of Kervyn de Lettenhove on this subject: "That Catherine de Medici carefully planned *the assassination of Coligny* there can be no doubt. Assuredly there existed in her mind *a secret desire* to get rid of all whom she believed formidable, and especially of the Huguenots, who at that moment were truly exciting in her the greatest apprehension. According to her own expression, she wished to take advantage of a favorable occasion, *del caso*. Nothing further can be stated. All contemporary testimony precludes premeditation as to the massacre of St. Bartholomew, which, in presence of an odious conspiracy,

was only a means of *defence* yet more odious but deemed necessary." (Vol. II, ch. xxxii.) The same historian concludes that chapter by saying: "Such has been the sanguinary day of St. Bartholomew, which, though often inaccurately examined in its causes and incidents, adds a new disgrace, more odious than all the others, to the ambition and craft of Catherine de Medici. A few hours sufficed for the Huguenots to pass in history from the role of conspirators to that of victims, and the Queen Mother, at a moment when all lawful weapons were in her hand, thought only of using those, which were to dishonor her memory for all centuries to come."

3. We referred above (n. 474) to the terrible provocation on the part of the Huguenots, not indeed to justify or palliate the awful massacre perpetrated by the emissaries of the king and the enraged populace, both in Paris and in the Provinces, but simply to account in some manner for the summary revenge dealt on their enemies by a provoked people. In those unhappy times, the Calvinist Protestants of France, called Huguenots, were perpetrating, as Grotius tells us, every manner of impiety and sacrilege, wantonly wounding the holiest feelings and deepest convictions of the nation. They pillaged, desecrated and defaced the churches, ruined monasteries, killed priests, dishonored the virgins of Christ, and slaughtered Catholics who refused to renounce their Faith. The images of the Saints were disfigured, the sacred vessels, the relics of the Saints were broken, and the Mother of God was blasphemed, the most blessed Sacrament was profaned in the most horrid manner by roving bands of Protestant marauders. After capturing La Rochelle, which they made their chief stronghold, they appealed to the Protestants of Germany and to Queen Elizabeth of England for aid in men, money and arms, which they readily obtained, and which they meant to employ to dethrone the legitimate king and usurp the crown of France. With these events before her eyes what wonder that Catholic France should view with alarm the violent efforts of a party, who did not disguise their intention of uprooting the national religion, and

whose acts were of so aggressive and formidable a character, directed to the destruction both of the Church and of the dynasty. Dr. Littledale, a bitter enemy of the Roman Church, whom he accuses of cruelty and intolerance, in his lecture entitled "Innovations" (1868, p. 19), speaks as follows: "Everybody knows there was a horrible massacre of the French Protestants on St. Bartholomew's Day, 1572; but few know that the atrocities which the Protestants themselves, ten years before, had committed at Beaugeney, Montauban, Nimes, Montpellier, Grenoble and Lyons, equalled, if they did not exceed that terrible crime. Again, I do not suppose there are ten people in this room who ever heard of the Nones of Haarlem in Holland. William the Silent, Prince of Orange, the famous leader of the revolt of the Netherlands against Spain, posted a large body of soldiers around the Square of Haarlem one Corpus Christi Day, when the Catholics were all at church. As soon as service was over, and the congregation streamed out, they were hemmed in and massacred by the Protestant soldiery. A slaughter of not much less atrocity signalized the introduction of Lutheranism into Sweden by the butcherly tyrant Gustavus Vasa (d. 1560)."

Such was Protestant toleration, Protestant liberty of conscience, Protestant piety and charity, when the odious Calvinistic heresy, embraced by the Huguenots, first appeared in Catholic France and in other countries of Northern France.

479. References: 1. See authorities quoted (n. 474) after article on the case of Galileo.

2. Civiltá Cattolica, Serie VI, vol. II, p. 648. A fortnightly Review published in Rome by the Jesuit Fathers. It contains one of the ablest articles that we have read on the subject.

§ VI. The Crusades.

480. We might dispense with treating this question; it is enough to read any impartial historian to find the justification of these warlike expeditions, which display Chris-

tian society in all its splendor of religious heroism. Hence, the Church is justly proud of having been the inspirer of those brave and noble undertakings. However, we shall say a few words concerning them and briefly prove:

1. That according to the principles of *justice* or in their motives, the Crusades were perfectly right and justifiable.

2. That *in fact*, far from having given rise to the disastrous consequences sometimes attributed to them, they produced, on the contrary, the most happy results.

I.—Lawfulness of the Crusades.

481. Their purpose was just, generous and civilizing. Mahomet had inspired his followers with the ardor of proselytism by the sword. Their fanaticism, at first victorious in Spain, then arrested by the valiant sword of Charles Martel, even dreamt of the conquest of the West and the destruction of civilization. The emperors of Constantinople were calling upon the Christians of the West to hasten to protect the last bulwark of Europe, and the Church added her exhortations to this pressing appeal. After Sylvester II. and Sergius IV., who had lifted a generous voice in favor of the Christians of the Holy Land, St. Gregory VII. wrote to the Emperor in 1074: "The Christians beyond the sea, who are afflicted with unheard of disasters and daily massacred like vile beasts, have sent to me their appeal in the excess of their misfortunes, entreating me to help my brethren by all the means in my power, so that the Christian religion may not be destroyed in our day, which God forbid."

In answering the appeal of Urban II. and Peter the Hermit at the Council of Clermont (1095), the Christian princes felt themselves assured that they were obeying the will of God. Up to that time they had only defended themselves; they now decided to carry the war into the very heart of Islamism. This was their duty and their right, for all the religious and social rights of the European nations were threatened by the Mahometans. Should Europe have quietly waited until the shame and scourge of slavery had

overwhelmed it? Should each Christian nation allow itself to be oppressed, in place of making with all the others a holy league against the common enemy? "When we blame these expeditions," says the learned de Guignes in *Memoires de 'l Academie des inscriptions et des belles-lettres* (Memoirs of the Academy of Inscriptions and Belles-Lettres), it is because we have not sufficiently reflected upon the condition of affairs. The Mussulmen, after having seized Syria by force, had rendered themselves masters of Africa, then of Spain, and of all the islands of the Mediterranean, from which they constantly ravaged the coasts of Italy. Through Spain and Corsica they penetrated into the Southern provinces of France; they pillaged all our ships met with on the sea. Constantinople was a powerful barrier against their invading hordes, and if they had been able to overthrow it, as they endeavored to do, all Europe would be threatened and run the risk of falling into their power. By attacking them in the centre of their empire, there was the hope of greatly weakening their power, as it was really done; they thereby received a blow from which they never recovered."

"In the wars undertaken against the Mahometans," says Father Broeckaert, "we behold the Papacy at the apogee of its political influence, and Christian society in all the splendor of religious heroism. It is for this two-fold reason that the Crusades have been, on the part of the enemies of the Church, the object of the most bitter criticisms. The glory of this age of Faith offends them, and the renown, which the Popes gained therefrom, irritates them: therefore what are the Crusades, in their opinion, but useless, ridiculous, and unjust enterprises? Although these attacks, thanks to Catholic writers, have lost their force, they have not entirely ceased, and the sons of the Crusaders are still obliged to defend their ancestors against the children of Voltaire.

We will point out the principal considerations that may be adduced in favor of the Crusades.

In every question of war, the fundamental point is the lawfulness of the motives which caused it to be undertaken. Now, the Crusades had for their cause not only the ordinary

legitimacy of a violated right or of an invaded territory, but also the legitimacy of all the religious and social rights threatened by the Mahometans. It is not necessary to dwell here upon the idea of the conquest of the tomb of Jesus Christ; this was a special object proposed to the piety of the Faithful; but the war was between two religions and two civilizations. If the sect founded by Mahomet in 632, had only been a sect, if the Koran had only been a crude rhapsody of ridiculous prophecies and vague morality, Christianity would have employed against it only the ordinary means of the apostolate and charity; but Mahomet had inspired his adherents with the idea of propagating their religion with the sword, and his fanatical followers were planning the conquest of the West and the destruction of civilization; against such enemies war was truly *holy*, in virtue of the most sacred principles of men and Christians."

II. Results of the Crusades.

482. The Crusades did not completely attain the immediate end for which they were undertaken, it is true, but as de Maistre says: "No single Crusade succeeded, but taking all of them together they succeeded." To form a true judgment of these grand expeditions, we must consider them in all their bearings, without stopping at abuses and faults, which are the effects of human passions and which are met with in all wars. See in the panegyric of St. Louis, King of France, the eloquent passage in which Mgr. Pie enumerates *the happy effects* of the Crusades. We shall note the following:

1. The conquest of Constantinople, and the enslavement of the East by the Mussulmen, delayed for four hundred years.

2. The West and Christian civilization saved from the brutalizing domination of Islam. The Ottoman power, which for centuries threatened to invade the whole world, was so weakened and fatally wounded that it now exists only through the sufferance of Christendom and the political jealousy of European rulers. This is so true that, should the European potentates agree on the partition, this

fact alone would sound the death knell of the Turkish Empire.

3. The nations and people of Europe freed from the calamities and disasters, which they were inflicting upon each other, through the discords and unceasing warfare continually waged by princes, nobles and towns against each other. The passion for combat, which animated every knight, found a noble field for its display; ceasing to war upon each other, the Christian warriors united their efforts against the common enemy.

4. The condition of the people was improved; serfs and vassals freed by thousands; cities and towns acquired rights and privileges that put a curb on the arbitrary and tyrannical powers of the feudal lords.

5. The advantages derived therefrom for agriculture, commerce, science, letters and art; and who will deny that these expeditions prepared the splendid centuries of Leo X. and Louis XIV.?

6. The spiritual good which they produced. "Can the Christian," exclaims Mgr. Pie, "confine his view to the present and forget the horizon which opens beyond the grave? What matters it to me, destined as I am, for the other and better life, what matters it that the Crusades should not meet with approval from the cold, selfish and avaricious calculations of modern economists, when the saintly Abbot of Clairvaux assures me that he learned from heaven that this employment of worldly resources, styled in the Gospel the mammon of iniquity, procured for millions of Frenchmen the permanent treasures of supreme beatitude? It was not long before they understood that their terrestrial country had not been impoverished and that their celestial home was enriched for all time by being peopled with millions of souls. Men of the present, you speak to me of figures, and I, a priest of eternity, I know of only one number that can interest me and which is uppermost in my thoughts, and that is the number of the elect that are to be eternally happy."

All these advantages fully compensate for the defeats met

with by the Crusaders through their dissensions and rivalries and because of the perfidy of the Greeks. Their reverses are attributable in part to the evil conduct of a great number of Crusaders, and in part to the treasonable behavior of the Greeks. Without the schism (n. 354) the Church of the East would have been able by herself either to convert and incorporate the Arabs, as the Church of the West had done with the barbarians, or to drive them away from her bosom. But ambition and jealousy, which had separated her from Rome, the center of unity, rendered her faithless to the cause of God (n. 354, p. 449).

References:

1. Panegyric of St. Louis, King of France, by Mgr. Pie, Bishop of Poitiers.
2. Broeckaert, S. J.—The Fact Divine, p. 250.
3. Desmond—Mooted Questions of History, p. 84.
4. Parsons—Some Lies and Errors of History, p. 286.
5. Kenrick, F. P.—The Primacy of the Apostolic See, p. 391.
6. Michaud—A French work on the Crusades.
7. Goschler—Dictionnaire Encyclopedique (Encyclopedic Dictionary), vol. 5, p. 433.
8. Alzog—Universal Church History, vol. 2d, p. 517 and 610.

§ VII. The Wars Called Wars of Religion.

483. The name, "*The Wars of Religion*," is generally applied to those wars which took place in France, between Catholics and Protestants, during the second half of the sixteenth century. They generally include many wars; the signal for the first was the massacre of Vassy (1552), occasioned by the Huguenots of Nimes; the third ended by the conversion of Henry IV. and the edict of Nantes. We also include under this name the wars of 1625 and 1626, under Louis XIII. and the wars of the Cevennes or the Camisards under Louis XIV. All these wars have afforded a fruitful theme for the declamations of Protestants and unbelievers. Nothing, however, is easier than to justify the Church in relation to these wars.

1. The Church has never admitted the *Mahometan* principle of imposing her doctrine by force. She has contented herself with protecting *her acquired rights* either in the society which she had formed, or over the persons who had made to her *a promise of fidelity*.

2. The wars of religion, dating from the thirteenth century, are the result of heresy and of its revolt against *the constituent principles of society*. The heretics did not content themselves with discussing; they committed the most barbarous acts against persons and property; they were the enemies of order and civilization, and the kings were obliged to repress them by armed force. (n. 453.)

3. That in these just and necessary wars on the part of Christian princes, there should have been at times cruel reprisals, was a deplorable thing, but it was difficult to prevent them. It would in such case be supremely unjust to impute these excesses to the Church, whose spirit is totally opposed to them.

4. Let us add, with the eminent French jurist, Montesquieu (d. 1755): "It is to reason wrongfully against religion to make the enumeration of the evils that it has produced (or rather of which it has been the occasion or pretext) if at the same time we do not take into account the good which it has procured; if I were to relate all the evils that have been caused by monarchies, by civil laws, by Republican Governments, I should have to say dreadful things."

It is certain that, if this method of reasoning employed to attack religion were legitimate, we should logically end by condemning and destroying all institutions, royalty, the magistracy, the army, and society itself. For if we peruse the history of all times, we shall find a dreadful succession of crimes to excite our horror; we shall see that civil dissensions and wars have ever covered the earth with blood. Even in our day, in spite of the general mitigation of manners and principles, blood does not cease to flow upon the battlefield. Would it be logical to conclude that it is necessary to abolish society, and that it would be preferable for men to live in the forests and to wander about like wild ani-

mals? This, however, is what would have to be done if turning our eyes from the good produced by an institution excellent in its nature, we were to confine ourselves to considering only *the abuse that can be made of it.* It is not in this way that a man of sense acts; in considering the wars of which religion has been the occasion, he pities humanity which he sees capable of abusing that which is most sacred on earth; but he is far from forgetting the innumerable and wonderful benefits which mankind owes to religion and to the virtues which it has caused men to practice. (See Confer. of Frayssinous. See n. 458).

§ VIII. The Revocation of the Edict of Nantes.

484. This act of Louis XIV. has also been the theme of declamations, absurd, it is true, but which strike the mind of the ignorant, and which pass from mouth to mouth without due examination. The principles hitherto established as to the relations which should exist between State and Church (n. 400), and the facts attested by impartial history, deprive this accusation of all force and value. We shall endeavor to be brief. For details the reader can consult the work of Léon Aubineau: *De la revocation de l' edit de Nantes* (The Revocation of the Edict of Nantes), and *La vie de Madame de Maintenon* (The Life of Madam de Maintenon), by de Noailles, and other works of reference to be quoted at the conclusion of this article.

HISTORICAL NOTICE. By his edict of 1598, first published in the city of Nantes, Henry IV. had granted to the Huguenots not only liberty of conscience, but also considerable liberty of worship and many great privileges. He also stipulated their right to be admitted to all the civil offices and to all the employments in the kingdom; the annual payment of a sum of 140,000 francs for the support of ministers of the reformed religion; the retention by the reformers of all the fortresses, towns and castles which they then held, to the number of one hundred and twenty, the King having engaged to pay their garrisons. It was nothing less, as Henry IV. himself said to Sully, than the creation

of a republican state in the midst of France. In the words of Guizot (d. 1874), it was equivalent to establishing a Calvinistic republic in the heart of the royal dynasty of Catholic France.

By an edict of the 22d of October, 1685, Louis XIV. radically changed the situation. He *revoked* the freedom of *worship* and the above mentioned privileges, whilst still leaving to Protestants freedom of *conscience*.

Let us remark that, especially in this case, there is a notable difference between these two expressions (n. 413). *Conscience* is altogether an *inward* affair, which necessarily is beyond all physical or external repression, whilst *worship* suggests something outward and sensible. When liberty of *conscience alone* is granted to a sect, public worship, meetings, and proselytism are not permitted. The adherents can simply live in peace in that country, without being molested as to their religious opinions and without being obliged to take part in practices of worship different from their own. Liberty of *worship* goes further; it permits the open profession and the unrestricted practice of any worship; it allows the organization of its clergy, its ceremonies and religious practices.

Was the edict of 1685 legitimate? Was it expedient or opportune? What are we to think about its execution and its results? These are the three questions which we are about to answer.

I. Was the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes Legitimate?

485. The legitimacy of the edict of Louis XIV. is easy to demonstrate. For even were we to see in the Edict of Nantes a *compact* properly so-called, it was certainly a *revocable* compact. The Calvinistic Protestant Grotius (d. 1645) admits it in these terms: "Let the so-called reformers understand clearly, these acts of *tolerance* are not treaties, but royal edicts issued for the general good, and subject to revocation, whenever the general good requires the king to do so." Louis XIV. had therefore the right to revoke the edict of his predecessor.

II. Was the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes Expedient or Opportune?

486. This is an *historical* question, which, properly speaking, does not concern the subject of the present controversial work. Let us, however, say a few words about the matter.

When we attentively study the condition of France and that of Henry IV. in 1598, we ask ourselves, could that king be blamed for acting as he did? Thanks to his edict, he was able to give peace to the kingdom and to establish order in all parts of the public administration. We know, moreover, that he intended to withdraw, little by little, the clauses of the edict which created a State within a State. Louis XIII., the Prime Minister Richelieu, and Louis XIV. (before 1685) carried out the intentions of Henry IV.; by skillful and successive measures they reduced the liberties granted to the sectaries to such an extent that in 1685, the total revocation was effected without difficulty; it was a ripe fruit which fell naturally from the tree. Foreseen by all and prepared from afar, the revocation did not provoke serious opposition. Moreover, the conduct of the Huguenots themselves amply justified the rigorous measures taken against them. Rising in revolt against the State, after having rebelled against the Church, they had been guilty of a multitude of profanations. Everywhere they had broken up crosses and images, burnt churches and convents, and by this conduct they had aroused against themselves the whole nation, which was profoundly Catholic. "These outrages, which were one of the principal characteristics of the Reformation, were also," says de Noailles, "one of the principal causes of the general repulsion which that new creed inspired." Then, the danger which was found in the principles of Protestantism, the revolutionary risings which it had excited in Germany, the seditious character assumed at an early date by its assemblies, all these things tended to impel the Parliament and the Government to protect the nation against these heretics. Besides, three rebellions in less than ten years, under frivolous pretexts, were more than sufficient to open the eyes of even

the most blind. The Protestant writer Buckle, in his History of Civilization, referring to this subject, says: "The Huguenot Protestants soon learned to despise that great edict of Nantes, by which their liberties were secured, and proceeded to rob and murder that very party, to whom they owed a toleration, which had been reluctantly conceded by the prejudices of the age. They were not content to exercise their own religion, unless they could also trouble the religion of others. At la Rochelle, which for importance was the second city in the kingdom, they would not permit the Catholics to have a single Church in which to celebrate divine worship, though Catholicity had been for centuries the sole religion in France, and was still the religion of an enormous majority of Frenchmen."

The act of Louis XIV. then was not sudden nor accomplished without due consideration. It was long thought over, and the king saw himself *encouraged* by public opinion to come to this decision. "The revocation of the edict of Nantes," according to Capefigue, "was a patient work, developed with particular solicitude and prudence." See *Histoire de Louis XIV.* (History of Louis XIV.), by the same author, chapter xxiv; in it will be found the plan and the intentions of the king, as written by the king himself.

III. What is to be Thought of its Execution and its Results?

487. A. As to the first point, impartial historians generally agree in blaming some of the measures adopted; they acknowledge, however, that the king cannot be held responsible for this, except for having confided in agents who failed to fulfill his formal intentions. As to the clergy, they had no part in the revocation except in rendering more humane the measures that accompanied it. Mr. Weiss, a Protestant writer of great ability, in his history of the French Huguenot Refugees, contends that religion had little or nothing to do with the revocation of the edict of Nantes, and that the king acted from political and social motives. Before concluding this subject, we cannot help acquainting our readers with the following judicious remarks of O. Brownson,

vol. 10, p. 380-381. "If the Huguenots of France had demeaned themselves as loyal subjects, if they had been contented with holding and practicing their heresy for themselves, and had suffered Catholics in their neighborhood to practice unmolested the true religion, the State might have permitted them to damn their souls as they insisted on doing; but when they abused the liberty secured to them by the edict of Nantes to disturb the peace of the State, to persecute Catholics, to sack and burn Catholic villages, to destroy Catholic churches and convents, to murder women and children, or to carry them away captive; it was the right, it was the duty of the civil authority to intervene and reduce them to subjection; for the first duty of every civil Government is to protect the Church and maintain the freedom of religion—of religion we say, not of heresy and infidelity, which, as far as we could ever learn, have not, and never had, and never can have, any rights, being, as they undeniably are, contrary to the law of God. (n. 412, 419, 425, 426.) After providing for the freedom of religion and fully securing to everyone the right to profess and practice it without let or hindrance from any quarter, it may be wise, just and even necessary for the Government to leave heresy and infidelity to take care of themselves, and to go for what they are worth. We are no friends to severity, and we are perfectly well aware of the folly of trying to force men into heaven. God Himself forces no man to receive his bounty, but leaves all men to their freedom (n. 425), subject, however, to the penalty of eternal damnation for choosing wrong; but we should be wanting in common sense if we did not recognize the right and duty of the civil Government, when heresy and infidelity undertake to propagate themselves by carnal weapons, by fire and sword, to intervene, and by physical force, if necessary, to coerce them into peaceable subjects and harmless neighbors."

A truly deplorable effect of the edict of Louis XIV, which we must notice, was the *hypocrisy and dissimulation* of Protestant families, who became *outwardly and feignedly Catholic*. These families carried on against Religion and the State a constant opposition, secret at first, but which, in later times,

during the eighteenth century, helped to ensure the triumph of philosophism. It was from 1685 particularly that the free-thinkers, plotting with secret Protestants and the Jansenists, began that fierce warfare, which ended in the suppression of the Society of Jesus and the outbreak of the French Revolution.

B. As to the material results of the revocation, it is difficult to estimate them. There is no exact account of the losses occasioned by the emigration of a number of French subjects who abandoned their country. The figures, which were brought forward in later times, are manifestly exaggerated. Moreover, in comparison with the enormous losses in money and human lives, which the Huguenots caused France to incur, the losses brought about by the revocation of the edict of Nantes do not deserve to be taken into account.

We must here brand the utterly unworthy partiality, the bad faith and hypocrisy of a certain class of writers who are always animated with bitter feelings against the Church. Undoubtedly the Governments of Germany, Switzerland, Italy, France, following the example of the reformers of the XVI. century, have, in our day, inflicted upon Catholics the harshest treatment. And yet, Catholics never claimed, as did the Calvinists, that they were a State within a State, imperium in imperio; they have never dreamt of defending their rights with weapons in their hands. On the contrary, they have given at all times, and they still give the example of the most complete submission to the ruling powers and the laws of the land, acting on the Christian principle that, though we may never be allowed by God's law *to do wrong*, yet we may, at times, be permitted or even obliged *to suffer wrong*. Why then persecute them? Why violently expel from their country thousands of priests and members of religious orders, male and female? Why? Solely because they are Roman Catholics! Do we see a single free-thinker protesting against these outrages? No; they would rather reserve their maledictions and bitter invectives for Louis XIV. and the Inquisition. The motive that inspires them can be a secret to no one.

488. References:

1. Parsons—Studies in Church History, vol. iv, p. 271.
2. Desmond—Mooted Questions of History, p. 261.
3. Fredet—Modern History, note O, p. 525.
4. Montagu—Popular Errors, p. 171.
5. Alzog—Universal History, vol. 3, p. 281-283.

§ IX. The Authority Exercised by the Popes during the Middle Ages over the Temporal Power of Princes.

489. It is known that during the Middle Ages the Pope was universally considered as the supreme head of the immense Christian family scattered throughout the earth, and that he acted accordingly; he cited before his tribunal both sovereigns and subjects; settled differences arising among kings, and inflicted spiritual penalties upon scandalous and incorrigible princes, and deprived of their dignities and rights those who obstinately persisted in disorder.

As this refers to the supreme heads of the Catholic Church, it is evident that their action could not escape criticism on the part of the enemies of the Church. Let us see what should be thought of it.

I. The Power Exercised by the Popes During the Middle Ages over Christian Rulers was Perfectly Legitimate.

490. 1. This power was founded on the legislation or *public law of the times*, that is to say,on the political Constitutions which Christian nations, their general assemblies or their sovereigns had *themselves freely established.* The Pope was then regarded by princes and peoples as *the natural Head* and *common Father of Christendom.* There is, therefore, nothing astonishing in the fact that Christianity should have acknowledged their right to judge the claims of the contending parties, to recall the recalcitrant to duty, and to compel them to render justice by means of excommunication and deposition from power.

2. The greater part of the monarchies of the Middle Ages were, at the same time, *elective and hereditary*; it was notably so as to those of France, England and Spain.

Generally a member of the reigning family was chosen to rule, but even the son or heir-presumptive, in order to succeed to his father, *had to be recognized by the general assembly of the nation.* It is easy to understand that these assemblies of the nation could impose *conditions* upon the princes they elected, who thereby became responsible to it. Now, as a matter of fact, one of the conditions generally imposed was *fidelity to the Catholic Faith*, and it was stipulated that if the prince deviated from it or persecuted it, he would, *ipso facto*, on that account *forfeit his power* to govern.

3. Besides, many princes had spontaneously offered their crown as a homage to the See of Peter, voluntarily submiting their kingdoms as fiefs of the Holy See and acknowledging themselves its vassals. Among these were John Lackland, King of England (1213), Robert Guiscard of Naples (about 1053), Roger II. of Sicily (1130) Peter II. of Aragon. St. Stephen, King of Hungary, had also, as early as the year 1000, offered his kingdom in homage to the Vicar of Christ, as Godfrey de Bouillon did that of Jerusalem. By virtue of these acts, the Pope had, as regards these States, the usual rights of a suzerain upon his vassals. But it is known that the feudal law conferred upon the suzerain the right to punish the felony of a vassal, who might fail in his obligations; he could reclaim his fief or confer the investiture upon another. The formulas of the oath taken by the vassals of the Holy See clearly attest this right of the Sovereign Pontiffs. Let us observe in passing that, as history testifies, no Pope has ever availed himself of this undeniable right, so as to appropriate to himself, in whole or in part, the States of a vassal guilty of felony.

491. Remarks. To judge the Middle Ages by the ideas which have prevailed since the Protestant Reformation, and especially since the Peace of Westphalia, by which equal guarantees are attributed to the various Christian communions, would be a deplorable and foolish anachronism. "All Christians," says the learned Cardinal Hergenröther in his work *L'Eglise catholique et l'Etat chretien* (The Catholic Church and the Christian State), "formed during the Middle

Ages one single family. For this family a head was needed, a father, and it possessed such a head in him, whom all nations honored as the Common Father of Christendom, the Vicar of God, the successor of St. Peter, the representative of Jesus Christ, to whom was confided the power to feed the lambs and the sheep." "By entering into the Church," writes M. Moulart, professor at the University of Louvain, "by accepting Christianity as the State religion, by recognizing in the lofty end or purpose of religion the conquest of heaven as the sole and supreme goal, to which should be directed all societies of mankind; by putting, as a natural consequence of these promises, their laws in harmony with supernatural dogmas and morals, the nations of Europe reached a veritable union, based on an entire *conformity* of ideas, interests, tendencies and legislation, and they thus formed that world-wide spiritual society which we call Christendom." (Read in *L' Histoire Generale de l' Eglise* (General History of the Church), by the Abbé Darras, about the contest between St. Gregory VII. and the German Emperor Henry IV. (vol. xxi).

The ceremonies that took place at the coronation of the Emperor of the West clearly show the ideas of the times. The Pope warned the Emperor that he received power that he might govern his subjects, and *protect the true Church of God.* The Emperor answered by the following oath: "I, King of the Romans, by the grace of God, future Emperor, promise under oath, before God and St. Peter, to be henceforward the protector and defender of the Sovereign Pontiff and of the Holy Roman Church in all her necessities; I will keep and preserve intact all her possessions, and will revere and respect her rights as far as I shall be able, with the help of God, in good and sincere faith. So help me God and the Holy Gospels."

The tenor of the oath explains perfectly the language held by the great vassals of the Empire towards Henry IV. at the time of his contest with St. Gregory VII. or Hildebrand. They wrote to the Emperor "that they had sworn fidelity to him, but on condition that he should be king *for the edi-*

fication and not for the destruction of the Church of God; on condition that he would govern according to the laws of justice, respecting the possessions, the dignity and the rights of everyone of his subjects." And they added that "since he had violated the solemn oath-bound compact, they on their part were freed from the oath of allegiance and fealty." These words of the great nobles make very clearly known the opinion held by contemporaries as to the Constitution of the empire.

As Father Schouppe pertinently remarks: "The Emperors of Germany were those who chiefly called forth severe measures from the Roman Pontiffs. They were in constant and serious disputes with the Holy See on account of the shameful traffic they carried on in regard to ecclesiastical dignities often conferred by them on unworthy subjects. The Popes had allowed them, in acknowledgment of the services they had rendered to the Church, the privilege of choosing and proposing subjects for bishoprics in their dominions; but the Emperors turned this privilege to the benefit of their own avarice and ambition, to the great prejudice of ecclesiastical discipline. St. Gregory VII., and his successors, who were zealous defenders of the rights of the Church, vigorously opposed these abuses. Moreover, in dealing with the Emperors of Germany, the Popes have been more authoritative than with other sovereigns, and this because these princes were exceptionally situated. In resuscitating the Empire of the West, the Papacy had established a *Christian Empire*, subject in temporal matters, to an elective chief. The election, as stated above, was accompanied by a solemn promise to observe the rules of the Constitution, the neglect of which should deprive the elect of his rights. Among the articles of the Constitution was the solemn injunction on the chosen Ruler of maintaining and defending the Christian Religion of his subjects. Whenever the monarch failed to observe his sacred pledges, the Pope of necessity became his judge, and he alone was competent to decide as to his shortcomings; and thus it happened that in passing judgment on the chief of the nation,

the Sovereign Pontiff simply carried out the provisions of the coronation oath by releasing the subjects from the oath of allegiance. The deposition, which followed, was but a legitimate consequence of the Germanic Constitution. Hence the political proceedings of the Papacy in the Middle Ages were founded on law, and were entirely in the interests of the princes and their subjects."

492. It might be asked if, as advanced by many authors, the power of the Popes in the Middle Ages *had not also another foundation* besides that indicated above, viz; if it was not also *by virtue of the divine right which belongs to them*, that the Sovereign Pontiffs have often intervened in matters of State. This is a question *subject to controversy*, and about which theologians differ, as the Church has pronounced no definite judgment on this matter. We cannot devote to this subject the examination that it deserves. Let us content ourselves with saying a few words only. According to the teachings of theology the Pope, who has received from God *direct* power as to *spiritual* things, as his own domain, has received at the same time *indirect* power as to *temporal* things, that is to say, that power which is necessary for the Church *that she may fulfill her mission.* On this all are agreed. But when the question comes to determine in what this indirect power consists, we are far from finding any agreement. Undoubtedly all theologians recognize in the Pope a *directive* power; it is to him that belongs the right to interpret authoritatively both natural right and divine right; to enlighten and direct, by doctrinal decisions, the conscience of Christian princes and people, to judge the morality of their acts and to inflict upon the guilty ecclesiastical penalties. But can he do more? Can he, for instance, outside the special cases mentioned above, resort, of course, for good reasons, to the deposition of princes, and free their subjects from their oath of allegiance? Opinions are divided, and the Church has given no decision. Bellarmine, for instance, maintains the affirmative (de Rom. Part. lib. 5, c. vii). Others, as Bianchi and Gousset, hold that the Sovereign Pontiff does not himself

depose the prince obstinately persisting in evil, but he confines himself to *declaring* that the abuse of power has been such that it entails by itself, *ipso facto*, the loss of power. There exists, say they, between a king and his subjects, a kind of oath of fidelity, at least implicit, and this oath is dissolved by the very fact that it becomes impossible for the subjects to preserve the Christian Faith unless the king be deprived of his throne; for, they add, the obligation *to preserve the Faith is of divine right*, whilst the obligation to obey this or that sovereign is of *human right*, which must yield to the former.

493. CONCLUSION. Whatever may be thought of these controverted questions, one thing remains certain, it is that at the time when unity of Faith was complete, when there was a close alliance between Church and State, there existed *a real agreement or convention* by which the Ruler bound himself to govern with justice, to defend the Faith, to prevent heresy and to guard himself from incurring excommunication. That was incontestably *the public law* of the period, and it is the *facts and circumstances of that epoch* that we have to take into account when discussing these questions. Did a Ruler become unfaithful to his oath, it was natural that the Head of Christianity should decide if he was deserving excommunication, and also to determine if the time had come to declare his subjects *freed* from their oath of allegiance to the unfaithful trustee of power, who, by the very act of unfaithfulness, had lost his previous rights. In this way we easily explain the conduct of St. Gregory VII. towards Henry IV.; that of Innocent III. toward John Lackland; of Innocent IV. towards Frederic II; and of Boniface VIII. towards Philip the Fair. This question has been handled in a masterly manner by the distinguished writer, the late Orestes Brownson, in several of his essays, where he demonstrates the following propositions:

(*a*) The Pope deposed no sovereign not bound by the tenure of his crown to protect the Catholic religion. Such was the case with Henry IV. of Germany and with the Al-

bigensian Counts of Toulouse in France. Such too was the case with Elizabeth of England. She was excommunicated by St. Pius V., deposed, and her subjects absolved from their allegiance. But she had personally professed the Catholic Religion, had succeeded to the crown as a Catholic, when the Catholic Constitution of England was still in force, and the Catholic Religion was a part and parcel of the law of the land. She was bound by her profession, her coronation oath, the tenure of her crown and the laws of her realm, to be a Catholic, and to protect and defend the Catholic Religion. When she turned heretic, violated the Constitution of her kingdom, oppressed her subjects, abolished Catholicity, expelled the Catholic Bishops from their sees, set up a new hierarchy of her own creation, and persecuted, exiled, imprisoned, hung and beheaded the Catholics for adhering to their religion, she deserved excommunication for her heresy and wickedness, and deposition for her intolerable tyranny." (Vol. X, p. 349.)

(*b*) With the testimony of history before us, we venture to assert that in no instance in the contests between the two powers have the secular authorities been in the right, and the Sovereign Pontiff in the wrong. The Sovereign Pontiffs have invariably used their power on the side of justice, and never have they deposed a prince who did not for his tyranny, his oppressions, his frightful iniquities, deserve to be deposed. They, whom they struck, were moral monsters, and the cause for which they struck was that of religion, virtue, innocence, and the liberties of their subjects, which they were trampling upon. (Vol. XI, p. 161.)

494. References. 1. Kenrick, F. P.—The Primacy of the Apostolic See; ch. ii, iii, iv and v.

2. Parsons—Studies in Church History; vol. ii, p. 144, 202.

3. Desmond—Mooted Questions of History; p. 65.

4. Guggenberger—General History of the Christian Era; vol. i, p. 277.

5. Joseph De Maistre on the Pope.

6. Broeckaert—The Fact Divine; p. 242.

7. Alzog—Universal Church History; vol. ii, p. 149, 185, 287 and 305.

8. Brownson's Complete Works; vol. x, xi, xii, xiii, xiv. See in vol. xx, Index of Subjects, under word "Pope," p. 586, 587.

II.—The Popes have made Use of their Right in a Manner most Salutary to Society.

495. 1. History proves that during all the Middle Ages the Popes have rendered a priceless service to Christendom, by preventing rulers from being unfaithful to their duties and by maintaining the people in rightful submission to their Rulers.[1]

Among Protestant writers, Voigt in his history of Gregory VII., and Hurter in that of Innocent III., have proven that the Popes had saved civilization by the vigorous resistance which they opposed to the corruption of their times, and to the ambitious and despotic designs of Henry IV. and Frederic II.

2. The Sovereign Pontiffs have often, by their decisions, put an end to quarrels among princes. In our day it is international congresses that have taken the place of the Sovereign Pontiff. But this system is far from offering the same guarantees of impartiality and enlightenment that were given by the Father of Christendom. Hence it was unable to prevent the partition of Poland, the abolition of ecclesiastical principalities after the French Revolution, persecutions in Switzerland, Italy and other countries.

496. Remark. After an impartial study of the subject, the part played by the Papacy during the Middle Ages has be-

[1] In 1861, in his work *L' Eglise et la Societe'* (The Church and Society), Guizot wrote: "Taking everything into consideration, the Papacy, and the Papacy alone, knew how to be the mediating power, by defending, in the name of religion, the natural rights of man against the usurpations of the State, of the Rulers, and even against the people itself. It was the Papacy that knew how to conciliate the weak with the powerful, by recommending everywhere and always justice, peace, respect for duty and assumed engagements; and it was in this way that the Papacy laid the corner stone of international law, by standing forth as a bulwark against the pretensions and passions of brutal force."

come so highly thought of, that a distinguished Protestant writer, Mr. Urqhart, has not hesitated some time ago to suggest that, in international questions, nations should renounce the present system of congresses and return to the supreme arbitration of the Papacy. Already, at the end of seventeenth century, Leibnitz said: "According to my view, Europe and the civilized world should institute in Rome an arbitration tribunal, presided over by the Pope, entrusted with the duty of enquiring into differences arising among Christian rulers. This tribunal, erected over Rulers, to direct and judge their quarrels, would bring us back to the golden age." The celebrated English Statesman Pitt also held this view, and in 1794 he wrote as follows: "There should be found a new bond to unite u. all together. The Pope alone could supply this bonds Rome alone would know how to make her impartial and unprejudiced voice heard; for no one doubts for a moment the impartiality and fairness of her judgment." And even Voltaire does not hesitate to assert: "The interests of the human race demand a curb to restrain sovereigns and protect the life of the people; this curb might, by universal agreement, be placed in the hands of the Popes."

References: Besides the authors cited, the reader can consult:

1. Gosselin—*Le pouvoir des Papes au moyen age* (The Power of the Popes during the Middle Ages).
2. Gorini—*Defense de l' Eglise contre les erreurs historiques* (Defence of the Church against Historical Errors).
3. Voigt—History of St. Gregory VII.
4. Hurter—History of Innocent III.

§ X. The Temporal Power of the Popes.

497. The discussion concerning the power exercised during the Middle Ages by the Popes over the temporal rights of Rulers leads us to say a few words about quite a different question, but one of great importance and of actual interest. We refer to the *temporal sovereignty* of the Roman Pontiffs.

"It was not without a particular disposition of the Provi-

dence of God that this authority (the Church) should have been provided with a civil principality as the surest guarantee of her independence." (Encl. "Immortale Dei" of Leo XIII.) As St. Anselm says: "God loves nothing more than the liberty of His Church."

History proves the *perfect legitimacy* of the temporal sovereignty of the Popes. It was so well prepared and brought about by events that, according to the words of J. de Maistre, "the Popes became sovereigns without noticing it, and in spite of themselves." Already in the fourth, and especially in the fifth century, the Church of Rome possessed extensive territories in many countries of Europe and Africa; and it is owing, in part, to this pacific royalty that St. Gregory the Great was enabled to perform the wonderful marvels of his pontificate. In law, the sovereignty of the emperors still existed, but in fact the paternal rule of the Roman Pontiffs had replaced their domination. The invasion of the Barbarians and the utter abandonment in which the Emperors of Byzantium had left unfortunate Italy, compelled the people to seek for safety and protection under the Papacy, which on several occasions had saved them from imminent peril, and which everywhere caused order and justice to reign around them. The temporal supremacy of the Popes, tacitly acknowledged by the Emperors of Constantinople, was singularly strengthened by the solemn act of Pepin the Short, in which he bound himself "to cause to be restored to the Holy See all the towns and territories usurped, and consequently wrongfully occupied by the Lombards." Not only was this promise fulfilled, but new territorial gifts were added by him to the restored provinces, and this liberal donation was sanctioned in 754 by an act of perpetual cession on behalf of the Holy See, signed by the King of the Lombards. Then came the rich gifts of Charlemagne, and later those of the Countess Mathilda of Canossa. The great Emperor, who only confirmed the pontifical sovereignty already existing for a long time, promised, as also did the French nobles, "to preserve to the Holy See the States that had been solemnly restored to it."

De Maistre was therefore right in saying that "there is nothing so evidently just in its origin as the pontifical sovereignty." "The temporal dominion of the Holy See," says the Protestant Gibbon, "is founded on a thousand years of respect, and the best title of the Popes to sovereignty is the free choice of a people delivered by them from servitude." Hence the logical conclusion: "If the possessions of the Head of the Church are put in doubt, all the sovereign families that reign to-day should prepare to descend from their thrones."

498. This is not the place to refute the silly objections, by which the attempt is made to establish absolute incompatibility between the spiritual power of the Popes and their temporal sovereignty. Gregory the Great was none the less a most beneficent Pontiff because he was also a prince; the exercise of temporal power did not make his life less holy, the Papacy less venerable, and the conquests of the Faith less rapid and less glorious. We see by the history of the Papacy itself, that *territorial independence* is, in the designs of Providence, truly a *guarantee* of spiritual independence, necessary for the Head of the Universal Church. "For the Pope," said Thiers in a celebrated speech, "there can be no *spiritual* independence without *temporal* independence, without sovereignty." What is seen in Russia and at Constantinople should sufficiently prove the truth of these words (n. 354). Napoleon I. himself had seen how important it was for the Sovereign Pontiff to be, as Bossuet says, "in a position to exercise more freely, for the common good, and under the common protection of Christian kings, his heavenly power to rule souls." These are the words of Napoleon, as reported by Thiers, the historian of *Le Consulat et l'Empire* (History of the Consulate and the Empire): "The Pope is not at Paris; it is well; he is neither at Madrid nor at Vienna, and this is why we reverence his spiritual authority. At Vienna and Madrid they feel the same with regard to Paris. Do you believe that if he were at Paris the Austrians and theSpaniards would consent to accept his decisions? We are therefore only too happy that he resides elsewhere than with us, and that, residing elsewhere,

he does not reside with our rivals. Let him inhabit in Rome, his ancient seat, far from the grasp of the Emperors of Germany, far from that of France and of the Kings of Spain, holding an equal balance between the Catholic sovereigns, always somewhat inclined towards the most powerful, and arousing himself promptly to the exercise of his authority whenever the most powerful should become oppressors. It is the centuries that have done this, and they have done well. For the governing of souls, it is the best and the most beneficent institution that can be imagined. I do not entertain these views through the impulse of religious devotion, but from motives of reason."

499. We could add other proofs in favor of the Pontifical royalty, and particularly its happy results for the good administration of the interior affairs of the Church; but contemporary events have undertaken to place under a bright light the advantages of this providential institution. Moreover, the unanimity with which the enemies of the Church have applauded the sacrilegious usurpations, to which we have been the sorrowing witnesses, their bitter opposition to the restoration of the pontifical sovereignty, all these facts show forth to every faithful member of the Church the legitimacy and the expediency of the claims of the Holy See and of the Catholic world. It is in order that the spiritual supremacy of the Popes may be exercised freely and efficiently, that true Catholics will not cease to demand the re-establishment of the temporal sovereignty of the Apostolic See.

500. Before concluding this subject, we must call the reader's attention to a popular objection, very ably solved by Fr. Schouppe in his "Abridged Course of Religious Instruction" (p. 90–92), which is as follows:

"The Papal authority, it is urged, is entirely spiritual." Without doubt it is spiritual and divine; but, though spiritual, it does not exclude temporal means. The ecclesiastical, like the civil power, being intended for the government of men, must possess also an analagous exterior organization and means of action. The words of Jesus Christ,

'My kingdom is not of this world,' were a reply to Pilate, who asked our Lord if he was, as the Jews said, a king; and He answered that He was truly a king, but that His title need not alarm the Roman Government, because His kingdom was not like that of the princes of this world. He meant that He had not come to re-establish amongst the Jews the ancient throne of David, nor to form a kingdom prejudicial to the Romans, who were then the actual masters of Judea; but that the kingdom he had come to establish was His Church, which He had called the Kingdom of Heaven; a real kingdom, though unlike those purely terrestrial, as its tendency, its principal means, and its final term were purely celestial.

Such is the ordinary interpretation of these words. They do not imply, as our adversaries would have it, that the Church is an *entirely spiritual* kingdom, and that all temporal possessions must be foreign to her; but that the princes of this world have nothing to fear from the Church, whose aim is heaven, and not earthly conquests, though the *use of earthly means* is not denied her. Moreover, our Lord does not, as the learned Tolet remarks, say that His kingdom is not *in this world*, but that it is not *of this world*, because it in fact *does exist in this world* amongst mankind, and this necessitates the employment of such earthly means as circumstances may require. The temporal dominion of the Pope is one of these means; and according to the best authenticated interpreters, such as St. Chrysostom (*Panegyric of St. Babylas*) and St. Augustine (*Tract 15, in Joan.*), our Savior, far from declaring that temporal power was not His, only speaks here of the *origin* of His regal power, which He declares He holds, not from this world, but from His Father who is in heaven. The Pope may therefore be at once Head of the Church and sovereign of a temporal state, such as he has been ever since the eighth century, owing to the donations of Pepin, Charlemagne, Lothair, and later on, the Countess Mathilda. This temporal sovereignty does not emanate from the spiritual sovereignty, to which it is not absolutely necessary, seeing that during the first ages of the Church it did not exist; but from the eighth century it

was the means chosen by Divine Providence to maintain the spiritual authority of the chief of Catholicity in liberty and independence. And in our days, as well as at any previous time, the integrity of the States of the Church, and the temporal independence of the Popes, is a *morally necessary* condition of the free exercise of their spiritual authority; in other words, the possession of a temporal domain is necessary, not to the existence, but to the well-being of the Church —*Requiritur potestas temporalis pro Ecclesia Dei non ut sit, sed potius ut bene sit.*"

501. References. 1. P. Von Duerm—Vicissitudes of the Temporal Power of the Popes from 1790 to our Times. (French work.)

2. Brownson—The Temporal Power of the Popes; vol. xi, p. 114 and 137.

3. Lord Robert Montagu—Popular Errors; p. 190.

4. Fredet—Modern History; note g, p. 507.

5. Kenrick—The Primacy of the Apostolic See; p. 309.

6. Broeckaert, S. J.—The Fact Divine, p. 242.

7. Guggenberger, S. J.—Vol. iii, p. 323.

§ XI. The Bad Popes.

502. It is against the sanctity of the Church (n. 331) that the following accusation is made: The Church has not always been a school of morality, because even some of her Heads have dishonored the Pontifical See.

After what has been previously said, the answer presents no difficulty.

I. Can there be bad Popes?

Yes, undoubtedly there may be bad Popes. The Church labors unceasingly to sanctify her members; that is her mission. But grace, offered to man to enlighten his intelligence and strengthen his will, does not constrain him. He may refuse this grace and act contrary to his belief. He can do so only by stifling the cry of conscience and by trampling under foot a religion which never ceases to recall him to his duty, exhort him to virtue, and threaten him with the most terrible chastisement, if he persists in his evil way.

The Church therefore contains always sinners in her midst; always, side by side with the greatest virtues, there have been disorders and vices, the effects of the weakness of the human heart. Here we are reminded of our Savior's parable of the wheat and the cockle growing together: "Let both grow until the harvest, and in time of the harvest I will say to the reapers: Gather up first the cockle, and bind it into bundles to burn, but gather the wheat into my barn." (Matth. xiii, 30.) Here the distinction must be observed which exists between the authority itself, and the person who holds it, between the Pontifical authority and the Pontiff himself. The latter is susceptible of corruption, but not the former. Just as the authority of parents and monarchs is ever worthy of respect, though there have been numbers of bad parents and bad kings, so the divinely instituted power of the Popes has not become less holy because it may have sometimes passed into the hands of unworthy representatives.

The Popes themselves, in spite of their eminent dignity and the onerous obligations flowing therefrom, do not cease to be men; if they are infallible in doctrinal teaching (n. 384), they are not impeccable or *incapable of sin.* They may, therefore, fall, as St. Peter himself fell, but their sin is the act of *the man* and not of *the Pontiff*; these stains, altogether personal, do not contaminate the sanctity nor the authority of the *Apostolic See.* It is on such occasions that it is well to repeat the words of our Lord, "Whatsoever they shall say to you, observe and do: but according to their works, do ye not: for they say and do not" (Matth. xxiii, 3).

In this connection let us add the following judicious remarks of Dr. Brownson (vol. x, p. 252–253), which contain, in my opinion, a very satisfactory reply to the difficulty of our dissenting brethren, who are wont to allege, as a reason for not entering our Church, the sinful conduct of some Catholics, of the clergy or the laity, whose actions are in direct contradiction with the requirements of their belief: "There is an inexcusable want of science, as well as gross injustice, in holding the Church responsible for the conduct

of those members of her external communion, whoever they be, who disobey her instructions, and will not comport themselves as her faithful and dutiful children. The glory of the Church is not tarnished by human depravity, even though it may be found in persons holding the highest dignities. It is not fair to ascribe to the Church that which she has never produced, and which is repugnant to her. Our modern travelers, who have so much to say of the ignorance and corruption they meet, or pretend they meet with in Catholic countries, would do well to bear this in mind. The individuals they hold up as exhibiting the fruits of Catholicity, are precisely those who do not exhibit them: —are precisely those who neglect the teaching and break the precepts of the Church. The practical effect of any religion must be judged of from the uniform character of those who sincerely and faithfully practice it, not from the character of those who do not. Whoever would look for the fruits of Catholicity must look for them in her obedient children, who believe what she teaches, and do what she commands. The moral and religious worth of these no sane man can really question." In other words, the practice of Catholic Faith makes the perfect Christian and the Saint; its neglect swells the number of the reprobate. In one case we have the result of the rightful use of human liberty, co-operating with God's grace; in the other we see the dire effect of its abuse and the rejection of heavenly help.

II. In reality, have there been many bad Popes?

503. 1. History enumerates from St. Peter to Leo XIII. 259 Popes, who, with very few exceptions, have been irreproachable, and of whom a great number have been men eminent by their science, wisdom and virtues. The number comprises sixty Saints, mostly martyrs. Is not this a spectacle as worthy of admiration as it is of respect? Where shall we find, in the civil order, a dynasty comparable to this series of Rulers of the Holy Roman Catholic Church?

2. History mentions, it is true, some Popes who seem to form an exception, especially Stephen VI. and John VII. in the tenth century, Benedict the IX. in the eleventh cen-

tury, and Alexander VI. at the close of the fifteenth. In the first place, the number is small indeed; it disappears in the multitude of the others. Would it be just to be always inveighing against the *magistracy*, because some of its members had proven themselves false to their duty, or against the *art of printing* because there are writers who make bad use of this invention?

3. Moreover, it is proved that many facts alleged against the Popes have been, either invented by malice, exaggerated, or represented under false colors. For instance, the absurd story of the female Pope Joan, who, according to the legend, occupied the chair of Peter, under the name of John VIII., after the death of Leo IV. in 855. This fable, which was current for a long time, is admitted to be an historical falsehood by Protestants themselves and by unbelievers, such as Dumoulin, Bayle and Basnage. Reinkens, when professor of ecclesiastical history at the University of Breslau, said: "Do you know who yet believe this barefaced imposture, fabricated by the enemies of the Papacy? Only journals tainted with liberalism and Protestant school boys in the fourth reader." There is more than one Pope, whose memory unjustly traduced by writers hostile to the Church, has been completely vindicated, and, what is very remarkable, by Protestant historians. This is the case, for instance, as to Gregory VII., by Voigt, and Innocent III., by Hurter.

4. It must also be observed that the few accused Popes belong chiefly to an age when the secular power interfered with the liberty of Papal election, and sought to thrust unworthy candidates on the Pontifical throne.

5. Another circumstance worthy of remark is this: No Pope, no matter what may have been his private conduct, ever promulgated a decree against the purity of Faith and morals; not one of them ever taught anything or did anything *for the purpose of legalizing or justifying his offenses.* Assuredly the same thing cannot be said of the founders of Protestantism (n. 341–345). These gentlemen decided that nothing was more urgent than the abolition of celibacy for the clergy, and of monastic vows for religious. We can see

in this fact a striking proof of the assistance which God never ceases to give to his Church.

504. As a fitting conclusion to this article we cite the following appropriate remarks of Dr. O. Brownson, vol. x, p. 383: "We do not pretend that the Popes are personally impeccable, nor that every Pope has been a saint; but we have yet to see full evidence that any one of them, during his Pontificate, bas been a very bad man. Nearly all we read against some few of them is mere calumny, invented by men whose projects they had thwarted, or by political or sectarian spite and vindictiveness. We are slow to believe anything against a single Pope, and we have little doubt that even Alexander VI., after he became Pope, could be found, if the truth were known, to be, even as a man, worthy of our respect. When we find a Pope painted in very black colors, we always take it for granted that there were very wicked men in his reign, whose schemes and wickedness he defeated, and whose pride and ambition he offended. The Sovereign Pontiff is under God, the fountain of all the authority we respect on earth, and we have no praise for those who offer him insults, or withhold from him the loyalty of their hearts. The saddest page of all modern history is that which records the ingratitude of individuals and nations to the holy Pontiffs, who for these eighteen hundred years have ruled the Church of God, and labored for the eternal welfare of mankind. They have borne the brunt of the battle; they have been the mark of every arrow; they have been the peculiar objects of the wrath of men and the assaults of hell. They have often been insulted by their own children; and scarcely one drop of consolation have they, during those long ages, been permitted to taste, except that consolation, which is vouchsafed them by the interior visits of the Holy Spirit. O, how the world has wronged them, and how slow and how loath are we ourselves to make them some reparation! O, let our hearts gush forth in warm and pure love to the Vicegerent of God on earth, and never for a moment suffer a mere secular prince to weigh in the balance with him!"

References: 1. Gorini—Defense of the Church against the Historical Errors of Guizot, Thierry, Quinet, etc.—French work of great repute.

2. Hergenröther—Ecclesiastical History.

3. Pastor—History of the Popes.

4. Parsons—Lies and Errors of History, Pope Alexander VI.

5. Kenrick—The Primacy of the Apostolic See; p. 502.

6. Ferreiroa—Apologetic History of the Popes from St. Peter to the reigning Pontiff Leo XIII.; in ten volumes. A Spanish standard work of great merit. An Italian edition is in course of publication by Marietti, Turin, Italy.

§ XII. Other Charges and Objections from Non-Catholics.

505. Under this general heading we here intend to group several other difficulties commonly raised against the Catholic Church. They are the following:

1. Devotion to the Mother of God, the Saints and Angels, and their invocation.

2. The Catholic Doctrine on Indulgences.

3. The dogma of Purgatory and the Suffrages for the benefit of the departed, who died in Christ.

4. The use of Sacred Images, Medals, Beads, Holy Water and blessed Ashes.

5. The veneration of the Relics of the Saints.

6. The use of the Latin language, particularly in the sacred service.

7. Holy Communion given to the Faithful only under one kind.

8. The doctrine of Transubstantiation.

9. Sacramental Confession or the Tribunal of Penance.

10. The Ceremonies and Ritual of the Church.

11. The transmission of the sin of Adam to his posterity.

In the first place, as most of the aforementioned subjects contain articles of Faith solemnly defined by the Church, a general answer to all the difficulties raised by non-Catholics against them is found in our article on the Infallibility of the Church, in which that divine privilege or prerogative

has been demonstrated by arguments that admit of no reply. (See n. 379-390).

To give the reader some idea of the overwhelming testimony—*nubes testium*—that Catholic writers can allege from the unbroken tradition of the past eighteen centuries in confirmation of the dogmas defined by the Church, let me briefly refer to the one mentioned above (n. 8) viz., *Transubstantiation*, as an instance in point. By this term is meant the miraculous, astounding change of the elements of bread and wine into the sacred Body and precious Blood of Jesus Christ by the words of consecration in holy Mass, a prodigy effected by divine omnipotence through the ministry of validly ordained priests. This is the article of faith, which a German Benedictine monk, Conrad Boppert, undertook to demonstrate in a most valuable work, that cost him eighteen long years of indefatigable labor. The result was truly marvelous. His researches in the monuments of antiquity, from the dawn of the Christian era up to his time (A. D. 1811), enabled him to bring as witnesses to the truth of Christ's real presence in the Sacrament of Holy Eucharist the following array of authorities, viz.: 18 General and 62 Particular Councils, 8 Ancient Liturgies, and upward of 4300 quotations from 300 writers, representing the Christian learning of the past in every part of the Christian world!

A similar line of arguments might be followed in proving any other dogma believed and defined by the Catholic Church. Indeed, we may here exclaim with the royal prophet, "Thy testimonies, O Lord, have become exceedingly credible" (Psal. 92, v. 7). Is there in the wide world any historical fact, any belief or creed resting on such testimonies as these? And is it not the height of presumption, stupidity and pride to refuse to accept the authority of such witnesses as those alleged on behalf of that dogma? Now among the witnesses to the truth of the real presence of Jesus Christ in the Holy Eucharist we reckon Saints, holy Martyrs, who shed their blood for the Faith, Popes, Bishops, Priests, theologians, the brightest intellects that

ever lived, and the many millions of the Faithful that lived and died in the Catholic Church during the last eighteen centuries. Were they all deceived? Were they all idolaters? And did they all conspire to deceive their hearers and their readers? And did the divine Redeemer permit such a monstrous, huge deception in His Church during the last nineteen hundred years, in spite of His solemn promise, that the gates of hell, therefore of error, shall not prevail against her? And must we then be compelled to believe that God, infinite holiness and immutable truth, inspired the Reformers, called by Littledale *unmitigated scoundrels*, and authorized them to reveal to the Christian world that the Sacrifice of the Mass is a downright superstition, that the worship of Christ in the Eucharist is damned idolatry and that henceforth we should reject the doctrines of the Catholic Church and accept the contradictory teachings of Luther, Calvin, Zwinglius, Beza, Melancthon, Queen Elizabeth and Edward VI, the boy King of England? But enough on this subject. The work referred to in our argument is the following: Scutum fidei ad usus quotidianos Sacerdotum, Opera et studio Rev. P. Conradi Boppert, O. S. B. Romae en Typographia Polyglotta de Propaganda Fide, 1898. 12 8vo volumes, price $2.50.

Secondly, as to devotional practices, or disciplinary measures, which do not necessarily involve any dogmatic definition, they are doubtless worthy of all respect, when we consider their venerable antiquity, often traced to the times of the Apostles, and the manifold spiritual benefits they invariably produce.

506. Moreover, it is a well-known fact that all the objections ever raised by unbelievers and other non-Catholics against the dogmas and practices of the Roman Catholic Church have been triumphantly answered by Catholic writers, as proved by the numberless controversial works published throughout Christendom, and accessible to all who care to read them. To adduce an example out of many, the controversial literature in the English language of the last two centuries has enriched our libraries with masterpieces, that

will bear comparison with the productions of any other civilized country.

Hence we deem it advisable not to repeat here what has been said by others hundreds of times; and we simply refer the reader to such works as contain complete and unanswerable replies to the objections referred to above (n. 505).

507. 1. Rev. Thomas Maguire—Lenten Lectures; New York, Christian Press Association.

2. Right Rev. John Milner—The End of Religious Controversy.

3. Rev. C. F. Smarius, S. J.—Points of Controversy.

4. Rev. F. P. Devine—Eutropia; London, Burns & Oates.

5. Rev. V. Hornyold, S. J.—The Faith of Old England.

6. Roads to Rome, Records of Recent Converts; London, Longmans, Green & Co., 1901.

7. Laforet—Why Men do not Believe.

8. Rev. Faá di Bruno—Catholic Belief.

9. Bishop England's Works—5 volumes.

10. Discussion between Rev. John Hughes of the Roman Catholic Church and Rev. John Breckenridge of the Presbyterian Church; Baltimore, John Murphy & Co., 1856.

11. Controversial discussion between the Rev. Thomas Maguire and the Rev. Richard T. P. Pope; New York, Sadlier & Co.

12. A debate on the Roman Catholic Religion between Alexander Campbell of Bethany, Virginia, and the Rt. Rev. John B. Purcell, Bishop of Cincinnati; New York, Benziger Brothers.

13. The Celebrated Answer to the Rev. C. Lesley's Case stated between the Church of Rome and the Church of England, by Rev. R. Manning.

14. Luke Rivington—Authority, or Plain Reasons for Joining the Church of Rome.

15. Rev. John McLaughlin—The Divine Plan, where Realized, and where not; London, Burns & Oates, 1901.

16. Rev. Charles Coupe, S. J.—Where is the Church? Catholic Truth Society; London, 1900.

17. Rev. T. F. Knox, Oratorian—When does the Church Speak Infallibly? Burns & Oates, London.

18. Rev. T. E. Bridgett, C. H. R—The Ritual of the New Testament; London, Burns & Oates, 1887.

The Yorke-Wendte Controversy; Discussion between Rev. Chas. W. Wendte, D. D., and Rev. Peter C. Yorke; San Francisco, Monitor Publishing Company, 1896.

CHAPTER V.

The Church and Civilization.

508. "The Church, the immortal work of a merciful God, has for her first and essential mission to save souls, and to lead them to the possession of the happiness of heaven. Yet even in the domain of purely terrestrial interests she is the source from which naturally flow advantages so numerous, so precious, that she could scarcely produce greater benefits, even if she had been founded only and specially to promote the happiness of the present life." Encyclical *Immortale Dei*, by Leo XIII.

It is to a commentary on the words of the learned Pontiff that we shall devote this chapter. We shall, therefore, show what the Church has done for civilization and the temporal happiness of mankind; but we cannot evidently give to a subject so beautiful and so vast all the development it deserves; this would require a whole volume. We shall, however, endeavor to say enough to establish this fact, that in the benefits brought to the world by the Church we evidently recognize *a new mark of her divine origin*; the tree is known by its fruit. "By their fruits you shall know them," said the Saviour of the world. (Math. vii, 16.)

Civilization has for its object the development, the perfection and the well-being of the *whole* man in the sphere of *actual* life. It necessarily requires, therefore, that he should be able to satisfy the legitimate aspirations of his *soul* and the exigencies of his *body*; that in his *family*, as well as in *civil society*, he should find order, peace, joy, all that can lawfully sweeten life; in other words, it is necessary that his welfare and progress should comprise, in just proportion

and perfect equilibrium, his material, intellectual and moral interests.

Undoubtedly, *the proper and direct* mission of the Church is to preserve the deposit of Christian Revelation and to enable man to attain eternal salvation. Even if the Church had not labored for the material and intellectual progress of mankind, there would be no right to reproach her with neglect. Who would seriously think of blaming a *commercial* company for not having encouraged the progress of literature, or an academy of science, for not producing sculptors or musicians? And yet history shows us that the Church never ceased to peacefully contribute to the welfare of mankind *upon this earth*. "It is a wonderful thing," says Montesquieu, "that the Christian religion, which seems to have no other purpose than the happiness of the other world, should also be the cause of our happiness in this." It will not be difficult to convince ourselves of the truth of these words. They are, moreover, nothing but the philosophical and social commentary of the profound thought of St. Paul, who says: "Piety is profitable to all things, having promise of the life that now is and of that which is to come." (1 Tim. iv, 8.)

Let us prove it, by successively tracing a picture of the world as it was before the coming of Jesus Christ and as it is since His advent, under the rule of the Gospel, in the bright light of Christian civilization realized in the Catholic Church.

REV. JAMES A. GALLAGHER.

ART. I.—STATE OF THE PAGAN WORLD BEFORE JESUS CHRIST, OR PAGAN CIVILIZATION.

§ I. General View.

509. In the present day, that the Gospel has changed everything, regenerated everything, it is easy to forget its benefits or even to enjoy them with supreme ingratitude. Men speak complaisantly of fraternity, equality, philanthropy, of charity itself, but they too easily forget that it is to Jesus Christ and to His Church that the world is indebted for all noble, generous principles and civilizing influences.

Assuredly we are far from questioning the *material* civilization of the Roman world, at the time of the birth of the Church. On the contrary, we freely grant that it had reached *an extraordinary* degree of splendor. Our modern times, in spite of their wonderful progress and admirable discoveries, can hardly stand comparison with it. The reader can see in the book of Comte Franz de Champagny, "*Les Cesars*" (The Cæsars), a brilliant description of the outward prosperity of Rome. Neither do we refuse to admit the eminent rank that pagan Rome held in the *literary* world. Who would venture to deny to the writers of the Augustan age, the superior merit, at least, of form? Their style is enchanting and the art of eloquence had risen with them to a supreme degree. It must, however, be acknowledged that under these brilliant appearances and these captivating forms we find nothing but *fragments of truth*; a few lessons of practical common sense, a few noble, lofty thoughts; but not a body of doctrine, no lights forming a systematic, harmonious, consistent whole. In particular, as regards religious truths—the most fundamental, the most necessary for the welfare of man in this world and in the next—how many doubts, inconsistencies, contradictions and monstrous errors do they not contain?

No, this *material* grandeur and this *intellectual* superiority do not constitute *true civilization*; they can never make society truly happy. True and genuine happiness, whether for private individuals or for society, cannot consist in the enjoyment of worldly, transitory things. The real happiness of man is to be found only in the possession of truth and in the practice of virtue. It is so, because, as the Church teaches us, he is created to know, love and serve God in this world and to possess Him eternally in the next; his mind and his heart are made for the true and the good, that is to say, for *the Infinite and the Eternal.* Much as he may endeavor to turn away from his last end, to disown or ignore it, despite all, it remains his only end, and it will be always true to say with St. Augustin: "*Fecisti nos ad te, Domine, et irrequietum est cor nostrum, donec requiescat in te*" (Thou hast made us for thyself, O Lord, and our heart is

restless until it finds repose in Thee.) Experience, indeed, tells us that our heart has, as it were, an infinite capacity, that its desires are unlimited. To satisfy the thirst for happiness with which man's heart is filled, what can all created things do? They are barely as much as a drop of water compared to the immense expanse of the ocean.

Moreover, even from the point of view of *material prosperity*, what a sad spectacle is that presented by paganism! Who does not know that the number of the privileged favorites of fortune was extremely restricted? Cicero informs us that in populous Rome there were scarcely two thousand proprietors. At the time of Nero, six great proprietors owned one-half of the Roman province of Africa, that is to say, a territory more extensive than the whole of England. The *great mass* of men was truly *miserable*, and knew of the pleasures of their masters only to envy them. Pauperism was a hideous and desperate sore.

On the *moral* side, we shudder and are profoundly saddened on learning from the authors of antiquity the frightful condition of the world before Christianity. We acknowledge, without hesitation, that there are to be found in pagan antiquity, beautiful thoughts, generous sentiments, helpful and beneficial actions; it was because the image of God in man, though horribly disfigured, has never been *completely effaced*. But it is none the less certain that the most striking trait, *the universal and dominant* characteristic of the world before Christ, was pitiless harshness, and, at the same time, *monstrous immorality* in the institutions and manners of the people. The reality baffles description, and the corruption of our times offers nothing resembling that of the pagan world. There was in the mildest of men and among the most polished nations, a hardness of heart, a contempt of humanity, a hatred of the poor, a horror of the unfortunate, a thirst for blood, murder and infamies of every sort, so great and so universal, that with our Christian ideas, and, at this distance of time, we can hardly *conceive* criminal degradation so base and so cruel. *The whole earth* was given up to boundless pride, unbridled egotism, tyran-

nical sensualism, which remorselessly sacrificed everything to its desires. See Nicholas, book I, ch. iv; M. Kurth, *Les origines de la Civilization* (The Origins of Civilization), vol. 1, ch. i.

510. Hear how St. Paul sums up the history of the ancient world. Speaking of the pagan Romans, whose triumphant civilization had absorbed in itself all the energies and all the vices of vanquished nations, he boldly says of them with a tone of firmness which fears no contradiction: "Foolish, dissolute, without affection, without felicity, without mercy, filled with all iniquity, malice, fornication, covetousness, wickedness, full of envy, murder, contention, deceit, malignity, whisperers, detractors, hateful to God, contumacious, proud, haughty, disobedient to parents." (Rom. I., v. 29, 30, 31.)

Moreover, St. Paul is the most reserved of all the ancient writers. Plato, Aristotle, Aristophanes, Plautus, Titus Livy, Tacitus, Juvenal, Seneca, all, in a word, tell us of the horrors of pagan society, with a liberty and frankness of language, which makes us shudder. We there see what kind of morals were those *accepted and recognized* among the most civilized nations of the earth in those times. Foreigners, prisoners, the vanquished, the slaves, the sick, debtors, children, the aged, women, workingmen, all those who were feeble, all who suffered, all who labored, in a word, the great majority of mankind were hated, ill-treated, crushed to earth. The remainder wallowed in the slime of every vice; the vices themselves were deified; they had their temples, their altars, their priests in all the cities of the world; licentiousness had become a social duty, and immorality a public worship. (n. 262.)

Such was the pagan world before Jesus Christ. This world without faith, without hope, without love, without pity, without mercy, without virtue, a prey to every error, and wallowing in every shame, has been succeeded by the world which we know, all resplendent with the light of truth, purity and charity (n. 263). Whence has come this transformation, so wonderful, so impossible to foresee? A

cross, and on this cross Jesus Christ, the Founder of Christianity, dying to redeem and *regenerate* fallen and degraded humanity, achieved this triumph.

Can anything more be required to make known *the divinity of Jesus Christ and of His work*, the Catholic Church?

But this general sketch does not suffice to make us appreciate the immensity of the benefits which we owe to Jesus Christ and to the Church, our Mother. We must enter into some details, lest it should be imagined that we have overcharged with colors too dark the short description which we have made of pagan degradation. We feel, however, that we must omit describing its most hideous details in order not to wound the modesty of our readers.

References:

1. Baluffi (Cardinal)—The Charity of the Church; ch. iii.
2. Devos—The Three Ages of Progress; p. 1–23.
3. Guggenberger—General History of the Christian Era; vol. 1, p. 11, 19, 23, 26.
4. Darras—General History of the Catholic Church; vol. 4th, p. 163, et seqq. (French original edition; Paris, Louis Vives, 1889.)

§ II. The Fate of Individuals Before the Coming of Jesus Christ.

We will speak in particular of slaves, gladiators, the poor and workingmen, that is to say, *the great majority* of mankind.

I.—Slavery.

511. 1. THE NUMBER OF SLAVES. Duruy, former Minister of Education in France, addressing himself to a body of workingmen, told them very bluntly that, if they were living in ancient times, not one of them probably would belong to the class of freemen; all would be groaning under the horrors of slavery. Indeed, the figures given by history are appalling. In Attica alone, an official census, made by Demetrius of Phalera, returned 20,000 free citizens and 400,000 slaves. At Rome, individual patricians owned 1,000, 10,000, even as many as 20,000 slaves. According

to Chateaubriand and Mgr. de Salinis, six millions of men, who called themselves sovereign people, oppressed, trampled under foot and ground to the dust, one hundred and twenty millions of slaves. In a word, the number of slaves was so great that the Senate, according to the account of Seneca, would never consent to their wearing a special costume, lest they should realize by a uniform dress their own number. "Men are terrified," he says, "at the small number of free men." (Of Clemency I, 24.)

Slavery existed everywhere, among the most civilized nations as well as among barbarians; we can truly say that before the coming of Jesus Christ, the greater part of the human race were slaves.

512. 2. Idea or Estimation in which Slaves were Held. Antiquity unanimously taught that slavery existed by *natural right*, that is to say, that among men some are born to liberty, others to *servitude*. "Nature," says Aristotle, "requires that there should be slaves." The slave according to pagan ideas, was not *a man*, but *a thing*. Varro includes them among tools or implements of labor, and assimilates them to cattle. "There is, however, between them one difference," says he, "it is that oxen bellow, slaves speak, but the plough is adapted to both." "A shrewd proprietor," said Cato, surnamed the Censor, "must get rid of all old useless instruments of labor, worn out ploughs, old horses, as well as of aged slaves." Hence, when sickness or old age rendered them useless, they were put to death or left to die of hunger.

And let no one suppose that the law took the slaves under its protection. On the contrary, *it sanctioned these barbarous doctrines.* In its eyes, the slave was not the servant but the property of the Master. "He is rather a nullity than a vile thing, *non tam vilis quan nullus;* for him there was no rest, *non est otium servis;* he counts for nothing, the slave has no rights; he is as it were dead, *servitus morti assimilatur.*"

513. 3. Treatment of the Slaves. If these were the opinions, current even among men of learning, if such

were the laws, it is easy to imagine the fate of the unfortunates reduced to slavery by birth, war or indebtedness. We shudder with horror in reading the details given upon the subject by Fr. de Champagny, in his work "*Les Cesars*" (The Cæsars). And he only relates what all the writers of antiquity describe without the least sign of disapprobation.

As the Roman law recognized *no right* in the slave, *servus nullum Jus habet*, it follows that his master could treat him as a domestic animal; wound, torture him, take his life, without having to render account to any one for his conduct, for *in personam servilem nulla cadit obligatio* (no obligation exists in favor of the person of a slave). Such was the cruel Roman law. The law itself enacted that when a master was killed by his slave, all the others, no matter what their number, residing under the same roof, should be crucified. It is needless to say that the pagan master, generally as egotistic and as cruel as he was vicious, freely used his absolute right over his slaves, and that, if it were possible, he would at times even go beyond the ferocity of the law, by the barbarity of the way in which he applied it. The fate of these unfortunates was often so dreadful, that to escape it, they would in their despair throw themselves in the arena to be devoured by wild beasts. Caligula, finding that the beasts of the circus cost too much to feed, gave orders to cast slaves before them to serve as their food. See M. Paul Allard, "*Les esclaves chretiens*" (Christian Slaves).

II.—Gladiators.

514. Side by side with slavery, there was before Christianity something still more horrible: these were the games of the circus, and the combats of gladiators. To see men kill one another or to see them crushed and mangled under the teeth of wild beasts, was a great feast, the supreme joy of the people—sovereign. The day was not long enough, hence the slaughter was prolonged into the night by the light of innumerable torches. In exchange for the lost liberty this people only required from their base and tyrannical masters bread and public games: *panem et circenses*. It was to satisfy this thirst for human blood, that those immense amphi-

theatres were built, whose ruins cause wonderment in our day, and that very extensive hunting expeditions were carried on in distant provinces, to capture wild animals alive, which were to be let loose upon human victims in the circus. Great personages were vying with one another as to the number of wild beasts they would supply to the public games and the number of men they would thus have torn to pieces. The human combats were yet more horrible. We shall cite only one instance. To celebrate the triumph of Titus, whom they called "The delight of the human race," thousands of men were, during *one hundred days*, slaughtering one another in the arena; and this wise emperor himself, after the funeral of his father, supplied the circus with 5000 gladiators. The *good* Trajan, to celebrate his triumph over the Dacians, gave, during twenty-three days, public games, where 10,000 gladiators and 11,000 wild animals were engaged in slaughtering each other. In the mock sea-fights, for which they made immense basins, naval combats were simulated, in which thousands of victims perished under the waters. "It has been calculated," says M. Loudun, in his work "*L'antiquite*" (Antiquity), "that the combats of the gladiators cost yearly the lives of 30,000 men." It even occurred on one occasion that during one month 20,000 men slaughtered one another for the amusement of the people.

And these hideous spectacles, which at first were confined to the Romans, took place soon after all over the Empire, in Gaul, Spain, Greece, Asia. All these horrors were *sanctioned by the laws*, and applauded by the Sages of those days; no pagan ever dreamt of shedding a tear over the fate of these unfortunate victims. The victims themselves, on their way to death, forgetting that they had the right to live, rendered homage as a last farewell to the god Cæsar. As to Cicero, Pliny, and all the so called enlightened men of those days, they saw in these cruel games only a noble institution, *an excellent discipline* to fortify the people for endurance of pain and suffering. Pliny, in his Panegyric of Trajan, goes so far as to praise this prince for not having sacrificed the spectators themselves. Indeed, humanity was not always even carried that far. On one occasion, when

there was a lack of gladiators to fight and feed the wild beasts, Tacitus tells us, Caligula caused to be thrown to them a number of the spectators who were the first to arrive, after having cut out their tongues, to prevent their crying out and lamenting their fate. The more fully to satisfy this thirst for bloodshed, the Senate, as stated by the same historian, decreed that in the future gladiators should no longer fight in pairs, but in mass, as in real battles. (Annal, book VII.) See Aug. Nicolas, vol. I, book I, ch. vi.

III.—The Poor and the Unfortunate.

515. Marcus Aurelius, the philosopher-emperor, who passes for a sage of paganism, declares without any evasion, that to commiserate misfortune, and to weep with those who weep, is a weakness; Seneca says that mercy is a vice of the heart, and good people should carefully avoid it: *Misericordia animi vitium est; boni misericordiam vitabunt.* The truly wise, he says, are without pity: *sapiens non miseretur.* The following, according to Cicero, are some of the precepts of the stoics: No man is compassionate unless he be a fool or simple-minded; the man who is truly a man does not allow himself to be moved or softened; it is a crime and a wrong to listen to compassion.

We would rather not recall these things, that fill the soul with bitter sadness, but it is well to do so in order to show more clearly the depth of the abyss, from which Jesus Christ has rescued the human race.

In a society, where such maxims held universal sway, it is easy to understand that everyone who was a prey to misery or misfortune, far from exciting pity, only inspired contempt, disgust and horror. "To give food and drink to the poor," says Plautus, "is a two-fold folly; to the giver it is the loss of what he gives, to the poor it is to prolong their misery." "The poor man," says Epictetus, "is abandoned like a deserted well, empty and infected, into which the eye looks with disgust." At Athens, as well as in Egypt, a man in want of bread, who would beg for it, was punishable with death, according to the law.

IV.—Laborers.

516. As to labor, it can be said in general that among pagans it was an object of contempt. Agriculture and all branches of industry were considered as something dishonorable. Cicero barely made an exception in favor of medicine and architecture. Long before this, indeed, Aristotle had proclaimed that labor was unworthy of a free man. Plato applied to it the same epithet. Workmen were not regarded by the Greeks as worthy of the name of citizens. According to Terrence, to be respected one must lead an idle life, and not be obliged to work in order to live.

There would yet be many more saddening things to be said concerning old people, debtors, prisoners; but what we have said, following undoubted testimony, amply suffices to indicate the fate of those unfortunate creatures in the midst of a merciless society.

§ III. The Family before the Coming of Jesus Christ.

517. We know enough of the degradation into which the family had fallen among pagans. Where mutual affection alone should be found, there was nothing but brutal selfishness. The wife and the child, by the very fact that they were weak, were subjected to a brutalizing subjection by the head of the family, who was, not the husband and father, as with the Christian family, but the master and despot. This condition of things was after all only the logical consequence of the doctrines then universally received.

1. Woman, in the opinion of the pagans, was not the companion of man and his equal; she was an inferior being both by origin and by destiny. She was practically a slave. Like the philosophy of India, China, Persia, Egypt, the philosophy of Greece has always been merciless towards woman; in its view woman was nothing but an abject and wicked being, who had no soul. Hence her position was humiliating and degraded in the extreme; hence, among almost all nations, polygamy with its infinite train of evils; hence, among the Greeks and Romans, the habitual practice of divorce, which entails hardly less evils than polyg-

amy, and which was resorted to on the most frivolous and the vilest pretenses. Hence also the almost unlimited power of the husband over his wife and of the father over his daughter. During almost all the epochs of paganism, even in the most civilized nations, the right of life and death, in the husband and father, was acknowledged and guaranteed by the law. Generally sold by her parents to the man who desired to marry her, the woman became the personal property of her husband, and she was subjected to all the consequences of such a position.

2. The offspring was not better treated. The fate of the child was entirely abandoned to the discretion of the author of his days. At Rome, when a child was born, he was laid at the feet of the father. If the latter took him up into his arms, he was permitted to live; hence the expression: *suscipere liberos* (to lift up the children). If, on the contrary, the father left the child lying upon the ground, the helpless child was strangled or thrown into the public sewers, or exposed in the public squares, and there was left to perish from hunger. Infanticide and a thousand other horrors, which shock the human mind, were universally admitted and practiced among pagan nations. Tertullian must have been absolutely certain of not being contradicted when he rebuked the pagans of his day in this vigorous style: "Among those who surrounded the Christians, thirsting for their blood, among yourselves indeed, austere magistrates, who are so rigorous against us, where is the one who has not put his own child to death?" "Nothing is more reasonable," says the stoic philosopher Seneca (d. A. D. 65?) speaking on this subject, "than to remove useless things from one's household;" and the grave Quintillian, the Roman rhetorician (d. A. D. 118), declares that "to kill a man is often a crime, but to kill one's own children is often a very fine action."

§ IV. Public Society, or the State Before the Coming of Jesus Christ, and its Relations with Other Nations.

518. **A.** If the head of the family could oppress every

one dependent upon him, he was in his turn tyrannized over by the State. Among Pagans there was no sentiment of human independence and dignity; individuals had no existence except for *the State*; they were valued only as far as they could place at the service of the State their strength and their skill. One's country was like a *divinity*, whose orders, whatsoever they might be, had to be obeyed. "The State," says M. Fustel de Coulanges, in his work, "*La cite' antique*" (The City of Ancient Times), considered the body and soul of the citizen as belonging to itself, and in consequence it labored to fashion and reduce this body and soul to such a condition as to derive from them the greatest possible advantage. The human person counted for little before the sacred and almost divine authority that was called one's Country or the State. The autocratic principle "L'etat s'e'moi" (I am the State), attributed to Louis XIV. of France, had been anticipated and acted upon more than sixteen hundred years before by the rulers of pagan Rome. The life of man had no security the moment that the interests of the city were concerned. It was believed that law, justice, morality, everything should yield in presence of the interests of one's country. Government became in turn monarchy, aristocracy, democracy, but not one of these revolutions gave to men true liberty, individual liberty. "Pagans," says Balmes, "do not appear ever to have even suspected that the *end, that the purpose of society is the welfare, the happiness of families and of individuals.*" It was not without good reason, therefore, that the great Corneille (d. A. D. 1684) makes one of his heroes say:

> Je rends graces aux dieuz de n'etre pas Romain,
> Pour conserver encor quelque chose d'humain.
> (I give thanks to the gods that I am not a Roman,
> And can still retain some of the rights due to man.)

In these inexorable constitutions of pagan antiquity, all the rights and feelings of nature were disowned, trampled under foot and unmercifully violated. "All the rights of the Romans belonged to Cæsar; Cæsar was the living law and the true divinity of the city." (M. Périn, *les lois de la*

socie'te' chre'tienne—The laws of Christian society, vol. 2.) "We are at a loss to understand," says Laboulaye, in *L'Etat et ses limites* (The State and its Limits), "how the ancients could abandon into the hands of the master of the world that which seems to us to-day to be the most sacred right of the individual—I mean conscience, intelligence, labor. Religion, education, letters, commerce, industry, everything was in the power of the Emperor from the day that the people had voluntarily, or by compulsion, surrendered their sovereignty to the Cæsars. Neither Trajan nor Marcus Aurelius, though less tyrannical than their predecessors, had a moment's doubt but that their power was without limit. They governed in the name of the people; to attempt to restrict this unlimited power was high treason."

The worship of the *God-State*, and the adoration of the Emperors, as if they had been divinities in human form, may, we admit, have inspired acts of stern patriotism; but most assuredly they were far from contributing to the welfare of citizens and families.

519. B. The relations between *nations* were not less deplorable. It is in vain that we would seek in paganism for the idea of fraternity among nations, or even for the shadow of any principle of justice or international comity in their mutual relations. In the eyes of the Roman society was Rome; for the Athenian it was Athens. Outside of Rome and Athens there were none but barbarians, condemned ever to remain without social advantages and without culture. As a man owed himself entirely to his country, so also he could do everything against the stranger. Every nation considered other nations as its enemies, and in consequence only thought of subjugating them. Hence wars were unceasing and victory always cruel; massacre or slavery, these were, as the interest of the victor might suggest, the only fate reserved for the vanquished. The march of an army was marked only by sanguinary ruins. The complete destruction of Carthage, Numantia, Corinth, and thousand other cities, sufficiently attests the implacable cruelty of the victors. "The day that Athens decreed that all

the Mitylenians, without distinction of sex or age, should be exterminated, it did not consider that it was going beyond its right: and when, on the morrow, it repealed its decree and contented itself with putting a thousand of its citizens to death and confiscating their lands, the victorious city considered itself humane and indulgent." M. Fustel de Coulanges, quoted above.

520. References:

1. Hergenroether (Cardinal)—History of the Church; French edition by Rev. P. Belet, ch. 2, p. 61-108.

2. Darras—History of the Church; original French edition, vol. 4, p. 163-197.

3. Gibbons (Cardinal)—Our Christian Heritage; p. 322-358.

4. Rev. Auguste Riche, C. S. S.—The Family; p. 21-55, translated from the French by Mrs. J. Sadlier.

5. Baluffi (Cardinal)—Charity of the Church.

ART. II. STATE OF THE WORLD AFTER THE COMING OF JESUS CHRIST, OR CHRISTIAN CIVILIZATION.

§ I. General View.

521. "If Jesus Christ had not appeared upon earth," says Laboulaye, "I cannot conceive how the world could have survived the despotism, which was strangling it. I do not now speak as a Christian, I lay aside all religious ideas, and speak only as an historian. It is in this quality that I affirm that in politics, as much as in morals and philosophy, the Gospel has renewed men's souls. It is with good reason then that we date the new era from the preaching of the Gospel, for a new society sprang up from the announcement of the evangelical doctrine." (Work quoted above.)

We have shown in another place the miraculous rapidity with which the Church spread over all the world known to the ancients (n. 245). From that moment it became impossible for the world to remain as it was. And yet this prodigious change could not be *the work of a single day*; it had

to be accomplished by slow and persevering labor. It was, moreover, evident that a desperate struggle for life and death would take place between paganism, hoary with age, and the new religion; between the empire of Satan and the kingdom of Christ. On the one hand was material and brutal force; on the other, truth alone and invincible patience. Accordingly, the blood of Christians flowed in torrents for three centuries. But victory could not fail to rest with the work of God. With Constantine, the Cross triumphant became a sign of honor, and, by a dispensation truly providential, the heir of the Cæsars transferred to Byzantium the capital of the empire, as if to permit the seat of the spiritual power to establish itself in Rome, which up to then had been the seat of the civil rulers.

And yet the Church had not waited for the great triumph to labor for the transformation of the pagan world. This task of civilizing the nations of the earth began on the very day when, invested with power from on high, the head of the Apostles wrought his first conversions. By the very fact that the Church sanctified the souls of men, reformed the ideas, the sentiments and morals of individuals and families, she purified and transformed *mankind*. By her doctrine, her laws and her institutions, the Church was the antithesis of pagan society; by the very fact of her propagation, she was destined gradually to suppress or transform the cruel and iniquitous laws and institutions of the countries, which she was subjecting to her spiritual empire. "As Christianity developed and achieved the miracle of its universal propagation," says V. M. G. Descamps, "Roman jurisprudence had to undergo and did in fact undergo the influence of the Christian idea; an influence, indeed, only indirect under the pagan emperors, but far more effectual and direct during the reign of the emperors converted to the new religion."

522. References: 1. M. G. Descamps—The Action of Christianity Regarding Sciences and Laws; French work.

2. Troplong—Influence of Christianity on the Jurisprudence of the Romans; French work.

3. Balmes—Protestantism and Catholicity compared.

4. Hergenroether (Cardinal)—History of the Church; French edition, vol. 1, p. 243–313.

5. Darras—History of the Church; original French edition, vol. 4, p. 196–214.

6. Father Felix, S. J.—Conferences preached in Paris in the Cathedral of Notre Dame; 1860. The Christian Family—Original French work.

7. Baluffi (Cardinal)—The Charity of the Church.

§ II. The Condition of Individuals after the Coming of Jesus Christ.

I. Slaves and Gladiators.

523. To enter now into some details, the Church, by her doctrine and institutions, was inevitably destined to ameliorate the condition of slaves by raising them up from the state of shame and degradation, to which they were doomed, and finally freeing them from their fetters. Does the Church not proclaim that the slave has the same *origin*, the same *nature*, and the same *destiny* as his master; that his immortal soul has the same value in the eyes of God; that he also has been redeemed by the blood of Jesus Christ; that he has the right to sit at the same eucharistic table, and that he may even attain in the heavenly kingdom a higher rank than his master, where the degree of glory is measured by virtue and good works alone? "There is neither Jew nor Greek," says St. Paul; "there is neither bond nor free; there is neither male nor female; for you all are one in Jesus Christ." (Galat. iii, 28.) "There is no respect of persons with God." (Rom. ii, 11.) Writing to Philemon, the same Apostle spoke in favor of a fugitive slave in these touching words: "I beseech thee for my son Onesimus, whom I have begotten in my chains, . . . whom I have sent back to thee. And do thou receive him as my own bowels, . . . not now as a servant, but instead of a servant a most dear brother. . . . And if he hath wronged thee in anything, or is in thy debt, put it to my account." (Epist. Philemon, 10, 12, 16, 18.) This is the doctrine of the

Gospels. Without in any way disturbing the established order resulting from different conditions and powers, without forgetting the duties of inferiors towards their superiors, the Church emphatically proclaims the nobility of man before God. Could such a doctrine have had any other result than that of bettering the lot of slaves and gradually bringing about the disappearance of slavery itself?

Let us remark, however, that in spite of the solicitude for these unfortunates, the Church could not think of abolishing slavery *at one stroke*. In the first place, she had neither the *right* nor the *power* to do so. If in *the manner*, in which slaves were then treated, there was much injustice and many acts against nature, it cannot be said, without some reservation, that *slavery itself* is *essentially* contrary to nature.[1] Moreover, the political circumstances of the times would not have permitted the *simultaneous emancipation* of all the slaves; frightful disorders would have been the consequence of a general decree of abolition. There is no one who does not know that the whole organization of society was founded on the existence of slavery; industry, agriculture, trade and commerce depended mostly on the work of the slaves. Moreover, the slaves themselves were not prepared for independence; to proclaim them free, before having withdrawn them from their moral brutalism and made them men and Christians, or before having provided them with means of subsistence, would have been to subvert everything, to organize a general massacre throughout the world, and to condemn the slaves themselves to still greater misery.

Who does not know what happened at the close of the eighteenth century, when the French Revolutionary Republic liberated the slaves in the colonies? The cruel and sanguinary civil war, which, in 1861, broke out in the United States of America, between the North and the South, originated, as all know, in the question of slavery, the North

[1] It is never permissible to assimilate man to a thing, to arrogate to oneself *absolute* power over the conscience and the life of our fellow creatures, to despoil him of his rights as husband and father. Accordingly, it is well to observe, such was not the servitude sanctioned by the Mosaic law; such was not the serfdom prevailing in the Middle Ages, for it implied no idea of moral or social degradation.

claiming its immediate abolition, whilst the South supported its maintenance, colossal commercial interests depending on the issue of the great contest. True to the traditions of the Church, the Bishops of the United States, assembled in Council at Baltimore (1866), expressed the desire for the *gradual* emancipation of the slaves.

It was therefore wisdom on the part of the Church to proceed slowly, as she did. She could not proclaim universal and immediate emancipation, but by all the means that she had at her disposal, she effectually prepared the complete suppression of slavery. Under her inspiration, and taught by her views and example, Governments and individuals emancipated their slaves, and the laws of Christian rulers encouraged and favored the suppression of slavery. Meanwhile nothing was omitted to improve the condition of those unfortunate creatures. For more details concerning this subject, consult Hettinger and Balmes in the works already cited.

524. The combats of *gladiators*, which in the eyes of a Christian nothing could excuse or render lawful, had naturally to disappear along with slavery.

These cruel games were forbidden by an imperial edict, rendered in 392, in the name of Honorius and Arcadius. However, the thirst of the public for these spectacles was not yet fully extinguished. To bring about their final abolition, the blood of a martyr was necessary. On the first of January, A. D. 404, when the city of Rome was celebrating the inauguration of the new Consuls, a monk, by the name of Almachius or Telemachus, who had come from the East, suddenly appeared in the midst of the Colisseum. He threw himself between the gladiators to separate them. Then, addressing himself to the spectators, he exclaimed: "We celebrate to-day the octave of the coming of the Son of God, the Prince of Peace upon earth; cease, therefore, these inhuman games, invented by pagan cruelty." At these words, a dreadful tumult arose in the amphitheatre. The exasperated populace threw itself upon Almachius and tore him to pieces. The very next day, Honorius suppressed

gladiatorial combats. (Bollandists, Acts of St. Almachius or Telemachus, 1st. Jan.)

As to the barbarous transaction called the *slave trade*, the Church, always faithful to her traditions, rose up at the very beginning, and with the greatest energy protested against this horrible traffic in human beings. This is shown in the noble and courageous language used in their apostolic letters by the Pontiffs Pius II., Paul III., Urban VIII., Benedict XIV. (1462-1537-1639-1741). And, again, at the beginning of the eighteenth century, Pius VII. succeeded in interesting the principal Governments of Europe in the holy work of emancipating the slaves, and Gregory XVI. published, on the 3rd of November, 1839, new letters, proving once more the maternal solicitude of the Church for those unfortunate victims of the avarice and cupidity of man. Finally, who is ignorant of the crusade, organized under the high inspiration of Leo XIII., to deliver Africa from the horrible scourge, which carries off each year so many thousands of free men and loads them with the fetters of the most debasing and cruel servitude? Let us pray that, seconded by the great powers of Europe and the devotedness of generous hearts, the Church may be enabled to bring about at last happy days for that desolate continent.

525. References. 1. Leo XIII.—Encyclical In pluribus, May 5, 1888, to the Bishops of Brazil on the abolition of slavery.

2. Leo XIII.—Letter to his Eminence, Cardinal Lavigerie, Nov. 20, 1890, on the abolition of the African slave trade.

3. Baluffi (Cardinal)—Charity of the Church, p. 63.

4. Gibbons (Cardinal)—Our Christian Heritage, pp. 416 and 425.

5. Clarke, Richard, S. J.—Slavery in Africa.

6. Parsons—Studies in Church History, vol. 6, ch. xiii. An excellent article entitled, Pope Leo XIII. and the African Slave Trade. The Apostolate of Cardinal Lavigerie.

7. W. R. Brownlow of Trinity College, Cambridge—Lectures on Slavery and Serfdom in Europe; Burns and

Oates, 1892. An exhaustive work on the subject.

8. Brownson, O.—Slavery and the Church, vol. 17, p. 317. See also vol. 20, index of subjects under word Slavery.

9. Burnett, Peter H.—Reasons why we should Believe in God, Love God and Obey God; ch. xi, p. 294. Slavery under the Mosaic Code and Ancient Monarchies.

II. The Poor and the Unfortunate.

526. The poor, the unfortunate, all the disinherited children of fortune saw the assurance of a change in their fate on the day when Jesus Christ exclaimed: "Amen, I say to you, so long as you did it to one of these my least brethren, you did it to me" (Matth. xxv, 40); and when He proclaimed what would be the reason of the sentence to be pronounced on the last day: "For I was hungry and you gave me to eat; I was thirsty and you gave me to drink; I was a stranger and you took me in; naked and you clothed me; sick and you visited me; I was in prison and you came to me." (Matth. xxv, 35, 36.) All His life He never ceased to repeat what He called *His* commandment, a commandment truly *new* for the pagan world, that of loving all men, our brethren, as we love ourselves, or rather *as Jesus loved us.* He Himself chose to be born poor and to live in poverty; His Apostles were poor; for the poor and unfortunate of every kind He always showed a marked partiality; it was for them especially that He performed His miracles, to cure their diseases and supply their wants. He showed Himself severe only for the rich of hardened and pitiless heart. Is it astonishing, therefore, that the poor, the sick, abandoned children, the aged, all those who were an object of contempt or the victims of suffering should have been, from the very beginning of Christianity, surrounded by the most tender solicitude? Help of every kind was given to them, accompanied by tenderness and kindness so sweet and so ingenious, that the pagan witnesses could not refrain from exclaiming: "See how the Christians love one another!" Many, indeed, were attracted to the new re-

ligion by the sight of this hitherto unknown spectacle. And in later times, how many *institutions of charity*, of every kind, have been established; what a multitude of *religious orders* have been founded to succor and alleviate the numberless ills that afflict humanity!

We need not insist upon a truth so manifest, of which indeed, we have already spoken in another part of our book. (See n. 261, 262, 263.)

III. The Laborers or the Working Classes.

527. Is it necessary to show how the Church has elevated and ennobled labor and laborers? The very example of her Founder and of her first leaders speaks eloquently enough. See the work of Mgr. Giraud, *La loi du travail* (The Law of Labor). Numerous, indeed, are the institutions and the laws created or inspired by the Church during nineteen centuries in aid of the working classes, with a view to bring nearer together the various orders of society, to establish among them, through Christian charity, a powerful and permanent bond of union. The admirable institutions founded by the Church in favor of the laboring classes shone with the greatest splendor in the *Workingmen's Guilds* of the Middle Ages.

Unfortunately the fatal doctrines of the last century destroyed the edifice so patiently erected by the Church. The troubles and social upheavals, which were their immediate consequence, are known to all. But the Church never loses courage. With a zeal sustained by maternal tenderness, she labors in our own day, as ever before, to save society from the catastrophe that threatens it. Who has not read with admiration the Encyclical *Rerum Novarum* of Leo XIII. on the condition of workingmen: *De conditione opificum* (16th of May, 1891), in which he points out with so much wisdom the most efficacious remedies for the sufferings of the laboring classes, sufferings which are indeed but too real? That Encyclical lays down a full programme of Christian economy, that forms a notable contrast with the doctrines of anarchical egoism, propagated by the French Revolution. It is thus that, faithful to the traditions of the

past, the Papacy intervenes once more as peace-maker in the formidable social struggle of our times.

§ III. The Family After the Coming of Jesus Christ.

528. 1. WOMAN. In the eyes of the Church, woman is not, as in pagan times, an inferior, degraded being, the slave of her husband and an object of contempt on the part of her own children; she is the companion of man, flesh of his flesh, and bone of his bone; she has resumed at the domestic hearth the place of honor which belongs to her; there she reigns through love as the husband reigns through authority. It is by re-establishing the great law of the *unity* and *indissolubility* of marriage, raised to the dignity of a sacrament, that the Church has restored to woman all her moral dignity. Is it not the Church that has held up to the veneration of mankind, a woman, the Virgin-Mother, to whom the Savior Himself has shown the most profound respect? Is it not the Church that honored widows and made Christian virgins the objects of special respect? It is thus that one of its most indispensable elements was given to civilization, I mean a character conformable to the promptings of reason and the spirit of Christ's Church.

529. 2. THE CHILD. In like manner, in the eyes of the Christian, the child is the adopted Son of God, and destined for the heavenly kingdom; regenerated by baptism, he is the temple of the Holy Ghost; Jesus Himself, consented to appear in the world with all the weakness and miseries of childhood; in His public life He showed particular tenderness to children; He even declared that men must be like unto children to gain the kingdom of heaven; finally He fulminated terrible anathemas against those who would scandalize children. In consequence childhood has become, since the time of Christ, the object of the most tender solicitude. For children refuges, asylums, orphanages, schools and colleges have been founded; for him are all the attentions of the most delicate charity. *Magna puero debetur reverentia* is a maxim that is faithfully acted upon only in the Catholic Church.

§ IV. Civil Society After the Coming of Jesus Christ and Relations between Nations.

530. **A.** From what precedes, it clearly follows that *public society* has been profoundly modified by the Church. By the very fact that she changed the ideas of individuals and reformed the family, the Church consequently transformed *public* opinions and *public* morality. Undoubtedly among Christians vicious men did not completely disappear, because man retains, with his liberty, the possibility of failing in his duty; but vice was thenceforth constrained to hide itself, because it had become dishonorable, which was not the case in pagan society.

In proclaiming that "there is no power but from God" (Rom. xiii, 1), and that though seated upon a throne, rulers and heads of Governments are none the less obliged to obey the laws of God and to govern their people by *just and wise laws*, the Church put an end to *the tyranny of the State*, which in the past recognized no will superior to its own. Accordingly, what a distance there is between Nero and Theodosius, between Caligula and St. Louis!

In repeating, at the same time, *to subjects* the clear principle proclaimed by Jesus Christ: "Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's," the Church laid down the duties of citizens. The Christian cheerfully submits to legitimate authority; but his obedience is without baseness, because it is given to the representative of God; he, moreover, retains a noble independence, and when in its commands, human power ventures to openly contradict the divine law or the natural law, the subject, intrenching himself within the inviolable sanctuary of conscience, proudly repeats the words of the Apostle: "We cannot" (*non possumus*), "Peter and John answering, said to them: If it be just in the sight of God to hear you rather than God, judge ye." (Acts iv, 19.)

B. It is evident, that in view of these changes, international relations should also have become more temperate and should have assumed a more humane character. How could nations, convinced that all men are brethren, the children of God and of the Church, have continued to treat

their fellow-beings as barbarians and to inhumanly slaughter each other.

§ V. Transformation of the Barbarians After the Coming of Christ.

531. There remains yet the duty of saying a few words as to the manner in which the Church civilized the barbarian nations, which, in the fourth and fifth centuries especially, invaded every part of the Roman world.

Roman society seems to have been too profoundly weakened by the dissolving action of paganism to be capable of complete restoration. God called in the barbarians to make them the instruments of His vengeance upon the persecuting empire, and, at the same time, to renew, after their conversion, the decrepit West. It would seem that these savage hordes were conscious of their terrible mission; they called themselves the Scourge of God, *flagellum Dei*, as Attila said. The spectacle offered by Europe in the fifth century, after being overrun in every direction by the invaders, shows with what terrible cruelty these avengers of God accomplished their work. The reader can peruse upon this subject the work of Ozanam: *Les Germains avant le Christianisme* (The Germans before Christianity). We will content ourselves with a few brief quotations.

"In Spain," according to the chronicler Idace, "pestilence and famine followed the bloody footsteps of the barbarians, and public distress was so great that men fed upon the flesh of their own kind, and mothers devoured their own offspring."

In Africa, St. Augustine was so much afflicted by the sufferings inflicted by the Vandals upon the inhabitants of Hippo and in general throughout the whole continent, that he prayed to God to take him to Himself. "It was because he saw," says the historian Possidius, "cities ruined, villages destroyed, the inhabitants massacred or put to flight. Some expired in the midst of torments, others perished by the sword; and still others, reduced to slavery, served unmerciful masters. Those who escaped from the invaders

took refuge in the forests or amidst the rocks of the desert, and there died of hunger and misery."

Italy was not more fortunate, for it, too, was ravaged from end to end. Alaric pillaged Rome during three days; Genseric, with his Vandals, during two weeks, and the ravages inflicted by the latter were such that the word Vandalism has become the synonym of destruction.

The historian Gildas relates that "Incendiarism swept with its fiery tongue Great Britain from sea to sea; in the public places were seen piled upon one another the ruins of towers and city walls, the stones of altars, bloody corpses, the dead having no other burial place than the ruins of houses or the bowels of wild animals, or birds of prey." The reader will find in the discourse of the Abbé Perreyve *L'Histoire de la parole* (History of Speech), an eloquent passage on the invasion of the barbarians.

532. These horrible ravages cease to astonish us when we learn from history what these barbarians were from the physical, and especially from the intellectual and moral point of view. We may form an idea of this by reading the above mentioned work of Ozanam. The reader will see in chapter III, that among these people the family hardly differed from the pagan family, of which we have given above a description. Here also the head of the family was a tyrant over his wife, his children and his slaves. The warriors themselves, the only living force held in respect by the nation, were compelled, as soon as age and infirmities rendered them unfit to brandish the battle-axe, to take part with the women in the domestic labors of the family, and if they became no longer useful for anything they were left to perish. In Sweden old men were hurled from the top of precipices; among the Herules, they were burnt to death; among others they were strangled or killed with the sword, because it was said, to be received by Odin in the Wahalla (their paradise) a man must bear the mark of the sword.

Neither the tastes of barbarians, their morals, their institutions nor their religion, which inclined to feticism, and fostered their instincts for murder and carnage, nothing in-

deed about them showed them capable of regenerating the agonizing Roman society. Their invasions would inevitably have annihilated all civilization, if the Church had not been there to subjugate these nations themselves and bring together both the victors and the vanquished to the feet of Christ.

533. It is not necessary that we should set forth in detail *by what* means the Church converted these ferocious invaders into the Christian nations, which history offers to our admiration. Nourished by the same teachings, submitting to the same religious laws, obeying pastors, chosen indiscriminately from the two races, kneeling at the same altars and at the same Eucharistic table, the Romans and the barbarians necessarily would end by *fusing* together in a new population, called upon to reap the happy fruits of Christian civilization. We shall mention among the institutions particularly adapted to civilizing the barbarians, the *Truce of God*, the *Right of Asylum* and *Knighthood*.

534. However, it is easy to understand, the transformation was not *the work of a day*. It cost the Church much effort and many sacrifices to enlighten the intelligence and to bend the will of these naturally ferocious men, to mitigate their morals and reform their political institutions. Many centuries were necessary to polish their savage rudeness, to soften their fierce natures and to cool the hot temper of their blood; and long afterwards, along with the most heroic virtues and veritable marvels of sanctity, were often seen sanguinary customs and monstrous crimes; but at last, by sheer force of perseverance and patient firmness, the Church triumphed over the barbarian world, as she had triumphed over the pagan.

Concerning the ordeals or judicial duels in vogue during the Middle Ages, see *Etudes religieuses* (Religious Studies), for January, 1895. The following is the conclusion of the able article of the learned Bollandist, F. Ch. De Smedt: "From the beginning and throughout the whole of the Middle Ages, the Church never approved the custom of the judicial duel, and she often protested against it by the voice

of the doctors and Bishops most eminent for their learning and virtues; by the authority of her Councils and Sovereign Pontiffs. Never was the lawfulness of the duel proclaimed or formally admitted by any Bishop, Council or Pope speaking as a pastor of souls." As Dr. Brownson writes, vol. 10, p. 2 0: "The glory of the Catholic Church in the Middle Ages (A. D. 590–1400) is not that there was then no human depravity, no injustice, no ignorance, no superstition, no violence, no barbarism; but that she was able to resist the hostile influences, to which she was exposed, to preserve herself from becoming ignorant, superstitious, violent or barbarous, and that by unwearied effort and constant struggle, she was able gradually to get the better of those hostile influences, to subdue barbarism, to restore social order, to recover civilization, to place it on a solid and imperishable basis, and to provide for its future advancement. Here is her glory under the secular point of view. The darker the color, in which you paint those ages, the grosser and more revolting you prove these barbarians to have been; the more do you enhance her merit, the more unequivocal testimony do you bear to the fact that she is God's Church, upheld by His almighty arm, and assisted by His supernatural presence. Had she been human, she would have been carried away by the floods of northern barbarism, and have become herself barbarian; had she been human, had she not been God's Church, she could never have survived the wreck of the old Graeco-Roman civilization, but would have been dashed to pieces with it; had she been human, had she not been God's Church, she could never have stood firm and immovable, as wave after wave of barbarians rolled on and beat with fearful impetuosity against her—she could never have gained an influence over those ferocious hordes, whose sole occupation was war and plunder, penetrated their hearts with some portion of her own light and warmth, infused into their souls sentiments of gentleness, meekness, love and peace, and raised them to the foremost nations of the earth. The greater the task that she had before her, and the greater was her need of divine assistance, and the greater her glory in having accomplished it."

535. References:

1. Rev. Horace K. Mann—The Lives of the Popes in the Early Middle Ages, vol. 1 (in two parts); Kegan Paul, French, Trubner & Co , London, 1902.

2. Kenelm H. Digby--Mores Catholici, or Ages of Faith, 3 vols., P. O'Shea, publisher, New York, 1888. We fully endorse the eulogy of the publisher, which is as follows: "It may be safely affirmed that this great work has made its author's name immortal. No other work in our language--we believe we may safely say with perfect truth, no other work in any language—presents so completely, so felicitously, from every point of view, the claims of the Catholic Church to the veneration, love and obedience of every existing human being."

§ VI. Catholic and Protestant Nations.

536. Before continuing this study of the civilizing action of the Church, we consider it advisable to refute in a few words an objection, which, at times, does not fail to make an unfavorable impression upon the minds of the less observant. It is founded on the comparison of the Catholic and Protestant nations of Europe. There are not wanting men who maintain that the latter are superior in civilization, and who do not hesitate to attribute to Protestantism the honor of this alleged superiority and to draw from it an argument in favor of the Reformation. Let us set forth a few principles that will fully dispose of this objection:

1. The erroneous principles or tenets of Protestantism, as well as the truth of Catholicism, have many a time been demonstrated by undeniable arguments (n. 309–352). As long as those arguments and proofs are not refuted, the pretended claims of Protestantism to be the true Church of Christ, remain utterly void of any value or weight. They will be only the repetition of the vulgar sophism: *post hoc aut cum hoc, ergo propter hoc* (after this or with this, therefore because of this). Simple priority or concomitance does not in any way imply *causation.*

2. *Good* is found where *truth* exists. No doubt even a

false religion may in some manner be useful to the State on account of the remnants of truth, which it has inherited from Catholicity and still preserves; but it is none the less evident that pure religious truth, in its fullness and completeness, will necessarily be more effective in attaining this result. This is all the more certain, because, whilst it affords light to the intelligence, *true religion* also communicates to the will the strength to put conduct in harmony with belief, and thus powerfully contributes to the happiness of individuals, families and society. Moreover, we have shown directly, by undoubted facts, that Catholicity has created modern civilization, at a time when Protestantism was not yet born. What Catholicity has done in the past, why should it not be able to do in our day? Has truth changed or has the nature of man ceased to be what it has always been?

3. Many of the founders of Protestantism have denied free-will and have declared that faith without good works is sufficient for salvation (n. 342, 343, 344). Is such a doctrine adapted to civilizing a people, to securing them peace and happiness? With such principles what would become of public or private morality? It is true that numbers of *Protestants* do not follow, in practice, these subversive doctrines, that they look upon good works as a condition or mark of saving Faith. But the teaching of the founders of Protestantism nevertheless exists, and must bear its natural fruit.

4. Even admitting that, in our day, Protestant nations are superior in civilization, understood in the sense of our opponents, to the Catholic nations of Europe, this sort of pre-eminence, whatever it be, cannot be attributed to religion; for as the same causes always produce the same effects, this superiority should have existed *in each of the* preceding centuries since the beginning of the Reformation. Now, no one can deny that exactly the contrary is shown by history. At the beginning of the last century, Napoleon I. was practically master of Europe. Before his time, it certainly was neither Prussia nor England that held politi-

cal preponderance in Europe, but the nations, which were most profoundly Catholic, Spain, France and Austria. And then, if it be true that Protestantism possessed in an eminent degree this civilizing power, why is it that Sweden, Norway and Denmark, so long dominated by the Reformation do not also march forth at the head of civilized nations? And in our day, if France has lost her political preponderance, it is more assuredly not because her Government is too deeply attached to the Church, but rather because her masonic rulers are engaged in a bitter warfare against her, against her religious orders, against Christian education, and are doing their utmost to rob the nation of its Faith.

537. 5. However, we are far from being willing to admit the alleged superiority of nations separated from the Catholic Church in the matter of civilization. If it were only a question of political power, of material wealth, commercial shrewdness, or similar things, we could not see much objection to admitting that, at this moment, the balance leans to those people, among whom Protestantism is dominant. But a preponderance obtained by a few fortunate conflicts may easily disappear through contrary causes. Would civilization disappear at the same time as victory? Who would even venture to claim that it is to *religion* that Prussia owed her successes at Sadowa and at Sedan? It would be very easy to draw a diametrically opposite conclusion in favor of Catholicity from the history of previous centuries. Would any one say that the ancient barbarian invaders were more civilized than the nations they vanquished by their arms, or that the victorious Turks surpassed in civilization their conquered Christian enemies? During the time of paganism also there were rich and powerful nations, but their wordly renown was gained by sacrificing human dignity and individual liberty, trampled under foot and domineered in the persons of millions of slaves by a small number of free men. By the side of a few *colossal* fortunes could be seen among the citizens frightful misery and a degradation still more appalling.

538. 6. "The question as to the pre-eminence of na-

tions," says August Nicolas, "is the most fruitless controversy in the world as long as we have not agreed upon *the measure or standard* which is to serve as a basis in forming a correct judgment." The measure of excellence is not, most assuredly, wealth, luxury, commerce, industrial arts, enterprising schemes in manufactures, or even political power; but it is man himself, it is especially his soul, his intelligence, his free will. Now, as we have proved (n. 520 533), the Church has done everything for the defense of individual liberty, for the uplifting and sanctification of souls and thereby for the happiness of individuals and society. Moreover, as we have many times shown, the Church is far from despising the material progress and whatever contributes to the temporal welfare of civil society; she encourages and blesses the discoveries of science and the wonders of industry, which she cheerfully employs in the service of God. But she cannot forget that man is not placed upon this earth simply to enjoy the good things of the world; his chief end is to know, love and serve God, and by so doing to merit heavenly happiness. Entrusted with the duty of repeating, without ceasing, the divine words: *What doth it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul*, the Church does not wish that "the soul should be *sacrificed* to the body and the body to the paltry interests of earth." With the Psalmist (Psal. 143, v. 15), the Church attests "happy is that people who has God for his Lord." How can these principles, which subdue the passions and encourage all the virtues, be opposed to the true happiness of individuals, of families and of nations, with respect to their threefold development, material, intellectual and moral? The Ten Commandments and the Sermon on the Mount, which are the true principles of all civilization, are taught nowhere more efficaciously than in the Catholic Church. For true civilization implies a gradual improvement and perfectibility of the individual in particular, and of society in general, in their threefold character of moral, intellectual and physical beings. Hence, the three constituents of true civilization are moral, intellectual and physical progress; of these three constituents the first and most

indispensable is moral progress—the very essence of civilization, because it safeguards and secures the highest interests of man, those of eternity, the salvation of his immortal soul; and as that nation is the most civilized, which combines these three elements in the greatest perfection, so there can be no true civilization, no lasting prosperity, in a society, in which the physical or material progress, or even misdirected intellectual culture prevail to the detriment of moral principles and moral life. History proves the soundness of this view of the social question. In fact, we may ask, did polite literature, did the eloquence of orators, the wisdom of legislators, did vast political domain, the triumphs of industry, art and commerce save the most refined and enlightened nations of antiquity, the Assyrians, the Egyptians, the Greeks and Romans from decay, and ultimate extinction? All these peoples were swept by the torrent of moral corruption into the common tomb of nations, and only a few broken columns remain to-day to tell the traveler what were once the seats of world-wide empires. Hence, we are fully justified in concluding that purely intellectual and physical culture, even in its highest perfection, can gain, at best, but an ephemeral triumph. If divorced from morality it cannot perpetuate the civilization, to which a people, in the meridian of their greatness, may attain; and it certainly has never raised a fallen empire nor poured a quickening stream of vigor through the veins of a superannuated nation. This deficiency can be accounted for only by the absence of that pure and sublime Faith, which commanded the respect of the hordes that poured from the North into the South of Europe, as well as of that sublime moral code, which tamed those rude nomads, and raised them from the savage state to the loftiest heights of Christian civilization.

We might here appeal to facts and compare Catholic and Protestant nations with respect to morality. But we believe that statistics are not yet perfect enough to supply sufficiently accurate data to form a fair and just judgment on this point. However, in their present condition, statistics are not at all in favor of heretical nations. And then,

if immorality has made alarming progress in some Catholic countries, it is precisely because the precepts of Catholicism are not faithfully observed, and the so-called *modern liberties*, the offspring of liberalism, produce their natural disastrous results. We have, on the contrary, proved that the morality of the founders of Protestantism *would* necessarily bring about, as it did really bring about, dreadful immorality. Finally, the most moral and the most happy nations in Protestant countries are precisely those, in which Catholicity once flourished. As to the other provinces, it must not be forgotten that they still live, in great part, upon what they have preserved of the teachings and practices of Catholicity, which they professed in the past. If the depravity of morals is not greater, it is in spite of the maxims of Luther and Calvin, as we have already seen.

539. Here we cannot deprive our readers of two forcible quotations, which will greatly strengthen the arguments of the present chapter. One is from an English, the other from an American writer. Right Rev. Mgr. John S. Vaughan, in his able essay entitled, "National Decay and Romanism, or the Relation between Religious Truth and Material Prosperity," argues as follows:

"One of the most popular, and, at the same time, one of the silliest and shallowest objections against the Catholic religion, is founded upon the alleged want of prosperity of Catholic nations. Before entering upon a consideration of this objection, suffer me to give you a specimen of what I mean. Here is a characteristic instance, ready at hand, which I cull from a speech by the Anglican Bishop of Sodor and Man (see *The Record*, February 22, 1895, p. 184): 'See how God has blessed England since she accepted the principles of the Reformation, and how He has continued to bless her in proportion as she has been true to them. Why, 350 years ago, our coffers were deplenished, our land depopulated, through the Wars of the Roses, and we had no colonies and next to no commerce. To day it is our proud and true boast that the sun never sets on the British Empire, and in all respects God has poured His blessings

on our land.' Our answer is that this is a clear appeal to the vulgar and the ignorant. What have coffers, whether deplenished or not deplenished, to do with religion? It is Divine Truth we seek, and the unadulterated Word of God, as the one thing needful, not 'full coffers.' 'What,' asks Christ, 'doth it profit a man to gain the whole world and then to lose his soul?' If our Lord's Kingdom were earthly and material, there would be something in such an argument, but He said, 'My Kingdom is not of this world.' These men evidently think it is Napoleon I. once described England as 'a nation of shop-keepers.' So I must presume that this is an appeal to the commercial or shop-keeping spirit. In plain English, the argument amounts to this: Don't give up your Protestantism; don't join the Church of Rome; don't become Catholics! Why? Is it because you will offend God? Is it because you will not save your souls? No! Why, then? 'Because it does not pay. Because it is not a money making concern. Because it will not put gold and silver into your pockets. Because, if you become a Catholic people, you may sink into comparative poverty and lose your influence among the nations.' Here, indeed, is an argument worthy of a nation of shop-keepers! Suitable, indeed, to a 'parcel-tying and pence-counting generation.' I wonder what some of our sturdy old martyrs would have thought of such language! Imagine such an argument on the lips of the Apostles—of St. Peter, for instance, whose boast was that he had left all things to follow Christ; or of St. Paul, who confessed that, 'having food and covering, we are therewith content' (I Tim. vi, 8); or of blessed Thomas More, or Cardinal Fisher, or of anyone whomsoever with a soul above gold or a heart bigger than that of a shard borne beetle. When mixed up with religion and with duty to God, it is the argument of an ignoble and worldly mind. It sets religion before us as a money making concern. In sober truth, except to such as believe that Christ founded His Church for the purpose of making people rich, and nations prosperous, it is hardly to the point. Why, indeed, should English Churchmen be at so much pains to assure us that the

Church of God does not succeed in doing what it was not created to do, and what does not fall within its province, or within the scope of its institution?

In plain truth the whole argument is really founded upon a baseless assumption, viz., on the assumption that material prosperity and worldly greatness are unmistakable signs of God's favor and approval. But is there any truth whatever in this? Quite the contrary. God has nowhere promised any kind of temporal reward to those who follow the teaching and the example of His crucified Son and who walk in the footsteps of Him who had not whereon to lay His head. Where such promises do occur, in the New Testament, they are made not by God, but by the enemy of God, the devil. Yes! it was not Christ, but Satan, who, pointing to all the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them, said: 'All these I will give Thee, if falling down Thou wilt adore me' (Matt. iv, 7). They were offered as the recompense of apostasy, of sin, and of devil worship, not as the reward of virtue.[1] But why multiply instances? Let us rather end our exposure of the Prosperity Fallacy by a brief summing up.

1. Material prosperity and worldly success are nowhere given by Christ as marks of Divine favor and approval. 2. So far as Our Lord's words bear upon the subject at all, they suggest a diametrically opposite conclusion. (3) Limiting our survey to England itself, we are bound to confess that all that is really best and grandest in its Government and Constitutions has been inherited from Catholic rulers in past centuries, under the guidance of the Catholic Church. (4) And that the purely material wealth and commercial prosperity and worldly grandeur are not results of a change

[1] L. de Torrente says: "The inference would be, of course, that all those who possess kingdoms have been guilty of apostasy, of sin, and of devil-worship." How can a man of sense have written such a sentence! Is he unaware that the devil is "a liar, and the father of liars" (John viii, 48), and that he never fulfills promises, even though he make them? The inference, therefore, is that there is no warrant in the New Testament that prosperity will reward virtue, because the only guarantee given is given by one whom none can rely upon viz., the "Father of lies," and even that promise is given in favor of vice, not virtue.

of religion so much as consequences of the development of her industries, and the discovery and opening out of her iron and coal mines, and of the invention of steam and machinery, the natural multiplication of her population, and the protection afforded by her sea-girded coast, and so forth. (5) Further, we are sorrowfully bound to confess that the superficial pomp and splendor, and wealth and luxury, and outward show, of which so many boast, are more than counter balanced by the appallingly irreligious, immoral and vicious state of multitudes of its inhabitants; and the misery, squalor, wretchedness and degradation of enormous masses of her people. And (6) since the foremost and grandest, and most learned and gifted nations of the world have not invariably or even generally been Protestant, but in many cases Catholic, and yet more frequently pagan and idolatrous, either we must cease to regard material prosperity as a sign of truth and Divine approval altogether, or else we must blasphemously assert that God, the changeless and the eternal, is as fickle as the most foolish and fickle of His creatures."

Our next quotation is from the late Dr. Brownson, one of the most distinguished writers of our times, in his famous article entitled, "National Greatness," vol. 15, p. 523, where he reasons thus:

"Our judgments of the comparative greatness (and we may say of the comparative civilizing influence) of different nations depend entirely on the standard of greatness we adopt, and by which we judge them. We call a people great or small in proportion as they do or do not conform to our standard of greatness. Vary the standard and we vary our judgment. The people we called great, when judged by one standard, we may call not great, if judged by a different standard. All, therefore, depends on the standard we adopt. Consequently, in order to determine whether we are really a great people or not, we must first determine what is the true standard of national greatness.

What, then, is true national greatness? We answer, that nation is greatest in which men may most easily and effectually fulfill the true and proper end of man. The nation,

under the point of view we here consider the subject, is in the people. Its greatness must, then, be in the greatness of the people. The people are a collection or aggregation of individuals, and their greatness taken collectively is simply their greatness taken individually. Consequently the greatness of a nation is the greatness of the individuals that compose it. The question of national greatness resolves itself, therefore, into the question of individual greatness. The greatness of the individual consists in his fulfilling the great ends of his existence, the ends for which Almighty God made him and placed him here. No man is truly great who neglects life's great ends, nor can one be said in truth to approach greatness any further than he fulfills them.

In order, then, to determine in what true national greatness consists, we must determine in what consists true individual greatness; and in order to determine in what true individual greatness consists, we must determine what is the true end of man; that is, what is the end to which Almighty God has appointed man, and which he is while here to labor to secure. What, then, is the end of man? For what has our Maker placed us here? To what has he bidden us aspire? Were we placed here merely to be born and to die, —to live for a moment, continue our species, toil, suffer, drop into the grave to rot, and be no more for ever? If this be our end, true greatness will consist in living for this life only, and in being great in that which pertains to this life. The greatest man will be he who succeeds best in amassing the goods of this world, in securing its honors and luxuries, or simply in multiplying for himself the means of sensual enjoyment. In a word, the greatest man will be he who most abounds in wealth and luxury.

But this life is not our only life, and our destiny is not accomplished here. The grave is not our final doom; this world is not our home; we were not created for this world alone; and there is for us a life beyond this life." In the words of the American poet:

"Life is real! Life is earnest!
And the grave is not its goal;
'Dust thou art, to dust returnest,'
Was not spoken of the soul."
—Longfellow, "Psalm of Life."

"We can now answer the question we have asked, namely, in what consists true greatness? We began by assuming that true greatness consists in living for the end for which our Maker intended us. This end we know is supernatural and obtainable only by supernatural means. True greatness must consist in living for this supernatural end, and in yielding the supernatural obedience by which alone it is to be obtained. It evidently, then, consists in nothing natural, but in being lifted out of nature and placed in the order of grace, as we have said, on the plane of our destiny. The least in the order of grace is infinitely superior to the greatest in the order of nature. True greatness is, simply in that supernatural justice and sanctity in which man was originally constituted, which he lost by sin, which is restored by grace, and by which we are made heirs of the promises, and translated into the number of those to whom our blessed Lord Himself will give a crown of life.

"This answer is not ours, but the answer which Almighty God Himself gives us in His revelation. Tried by the rule implied in this answer, not a few of the world's judgments must be reversed. At one stroke we must cut from the roll of great men the immense majority of those the world delights to honor, and holds up to the reverence and emulation of our youth. Renowned princes, statesmen, heroes, poets, philosophers, scholars, authors, must lose their rank, and sink below that of ordinary men. The Saints are the only true nobility. No man is great but as he is good, but as he lives in the order of grace, and loves God above all things and with his whole heart and soul, and his neighbor as himself in and for the sake of God.

"We have now a standard of greatness by which we can determine who is and who is not great, and by which we may determine the real value of things and conditions. Am I poor? What if I am? Does my poverty interfere with my obedience? Does it or can it debar me from obtaining that justice and sanctity in which alone is true worth, true greatness, all that it does not belittle me to crave? Am I unknown, held in no repute, despised? What of all this,

if I am known and honored of God? What is it to me that I am despised by men, if I am owned by the King immortal and invisible, who with His own hand will bestow upon me a crown of life incorruptible and eternal in heaven? Talk of human respectability, of one's standing in society, of the honors one receives from the State or the mob! What is all this to him who is in the communion of the Saints and martyrs of all the ages and climes, who listen to his prayers, and bear them as sweet incense up before the throne of the living God? Am I rich, am I honored, have I praise of men, do the crowd run after me, the wise and venerable listen when I speak? What of all this, if I am poor in the grace of God, have no honor in heaven, no assurance of the reward set before me,—if, when I die, I go to hell, while the poor beggar, that lay at my gate, is borne by the convoy of angels to Abraham's bosom?

As of the individual, so of the nation. In like manner as justice and sanctity constitute the greatness of the individual, so do they constitute the greatness of the nation. 'Justice exalteth a nation, but sin maketh nations miserable.' (Prov. xiv, 34.) The great nation is the holy nation, rich in true obedience, and carried away by a divine passion for God and all holy things. Suppose your nation does increase in wealth, in luxury, in refinement; suppose it does fell the primeval forest and enlarge its borders, multiply its manufactures, extend its commerce, and make all climes pour their riches into its lap; what then? Does it follow that such a nation is great, is glorious, and has reason to applaud herself for her achievements and to exult over the poor and simple? 'Happy is the people whose God is the Lord.' (Psal. 143, v. 15.) Where is it written, Blessed is the nation whose God is Mammon, and whose worship is thrift? Where are the nations who forgot the Lord, who put their trust in their ships, their traffic, their wealth and luxuries? Where is that ancient Tyre, 'whose merchants were princes, and her traders the nobles of the earth?' Where are all the nations of the old world, once renowned for their extended commerce, the richness of their stuffs, and the variety of

their manufactures? They have passed away like the morning vapor, and a few solitary ruins alone remain to point the traveler to the seats of their world-renowned idolatry."

540. References:

1. Balmes--Protestantism and Catholicity compared in their effects on the Civilization of Europe.

2. Alfred Young, Priest of the Congregation of St. Paul —Catholic and Protestant Countries compared in Civilization, Popular Happiness, General Intelligence and Morality.

3. Baluffi (Cardinal)—The Charity of the Church.

4. Gibbons (Cardinal)—Our Christian Heritage.

5. Schanz—A Christian Apology, vol. 3, ch. xv—The Church and Civilization.

6. Baron de Haulleville—Protestant and Catholic Civilization Compared.

7. Cardinal Pecci (now Leo XIII.)--Pastoral Letters on Civilization for 1877 and 1878.

8. Hettinger--Apology of Christianity, and the eight following French works:

9. Nicolas—Philosophical Studies and the Act of Belief.

10. Chateaubriand--The Genius of Christianity.

11. Mgr. Dapanloup--Christian Charity and its Works.

12. Kurth--The Origins of Modern Civilization.

13. Ozanam—The Germans before Christianity, Christian Civilization with the Francs.

14. Decker—The Church and Social Christian Order.

15. Lachaud--Civilization and the Beneficent Influence of the Church.

16. Felix, S. J.—Conferences on the Value of Material Progress.

17. Maguire, John Francis, M. P.—Rome, its Ruler and Its Institutions.

ART. III.—THE CHURCH AND INTELLECTUAL CULTURE.

§ I. Influence of the Church on the Cultivation of Learning.

541. It was not merely by reforming the ancient world and mitigating the habits and manners of barbarous peo-

ples that the Church labored efficaciously for the happiness of individuals and society; she has also acquired an equal right to the gratitude of men for special benefits conferred by her in the *intellectual* order.

1. To religious and moral teaching, which properly constitutes an essential part of her mission, the Church, ever entertaining a maternal solicitude for man's progress in all his faculties, has never ceased to add cultivation of *human learning*. She knows that this knowledge helps the upright soul more quickly and more fully to grasp *the foundations of Faith* and religious truths. Hence, we see her inscribing *in her common law* the two following sentences which briefly and forcibly express her guiding policy: "Ignorance is the mother of all errors; ignorance is hardly tolerable in a layman; it is inexcusable and unpardonable in a priest." Who does not know the homily of St. Basil on *the advantages which young people can derive from the reading of profane classical authors?* St. Gregory Nazianzen, St. John Chrysostom, St. Jerome taught, as did St. Basil, and spent their leisure in spreading knowledge among those whom they were endeavoring to win to God. St. Gregory Nazianzen says: "The first of all the good things of earth is knowledge; and here I do not mean merely knowledge which concerns salvation and the beauty of spiritual things, but I speak of *secular* knowledge. To possess some refinement of morals or science alone, is to have only one eye. But they who shine in both kinds of knowledge are the most perfect."

This was always the thought and conduct of the Church. The Vatican Council, in speaking of scientific studies, has solemnly declared in its first dogmatic Constitution, ch. iv., Of Faith and Reason: "So far . . . is the Church from opposing the cultivation of human art and sciences, that she in many ways helps and promotes it. For the Church neither ignores nor despises the benefits of human life, which result from the art and sciences, but confesses that, as they come from God, the Lord of all science, so if they be rightly used, they lead to God by the help of His grace. Nor does the Church forbid that each of these sci-

ences in its sphere should make use of its own principles, and its own method; but while recognizing this just liberty, she stands watchfully on guard, lest sciences, setting themselves against the divine teaching, or transgressing their own limits, should invade and disturb the domain of Faith."

542. 2. Not satisfied with promoting everything that can extend the sphere of human knowledge, the Church herself has always been the most active center of mental activity. "Even in the fourth century," says the Protestant Guizot, "the intellectual condition of religious society and that of civil society could not bear comparison: in the latter there was decadence, languor, inertia; in the former there was movement, ardor, progress." In the bosom of Christianity, the intellect was ever being sharpened by serious and profound discussions. In these was liberally carried out the maxim: *In necessariis unitas, in dubiis libertas, in omnibus caritas.* (In necessary things unity, in doubtful things liberty, and in all things charity.) "Inquire into the government of the Church," says Guizot, "it is to reason that appeal is always made; it is the exercise of free discussion that is pre-eminent. What are her institutions, her means of action? Provincial Councils, National Councils, General Councils, constant correspondence, continual communications by letters, mutual admonitions and exchange of views on the questions at issue. Never did any civil Government proceed to such an extent by free discussion and common deliberation." It was especially in General Councils that this intellectual life was manifested, and we can repeat the words of a distinguished writer who says that "if their decisions had not been the fruit of divine inspiration, they would still remain as the cleverest and brightest evidence of human wisdom." See de Decker: *L'Eglise et l'ordre social chretien* (The Church and the Christian Social Order).

543. 3. What a magnificent roll of *thinkers* and *writers* is contained in the annals of Holy Church! Barely emerged from the catacombs, she saw arising for her defense men like Origen, Athenagoras, Justin, Tertullian; a

little later she sees budding forth the works of John Chrysostom, Basil, Gregory Nazianzen, Jerome, Ambrose, Augustin, Leo the Great; later still, she inspires the masterpieces of Albert the Great, Anselm, Bonaventure, Thomas Aquinas, Bossuet, Fenelon, Massillon, Bourdaloue. Who could count the remarkable works published in every language of the earth, for the purpose of setting forth, demonstrating, developing and defending religious truth? Who but knows that the finest *literary* works are due to Christian inspiration? Is it not amply sufficient to name the *Jerusalem Delivered* of Tasso, the *Divine Comedy* of Dante, *Polyeucte* and *Athalie* of Corneille? If Paganism boasts of the age of Pericles and that of Augustus, Christianity gave birth to that of Leo X. and Louis XIV.; if the former shone principally by literary *form*, the other rose far higher by truth and elevation of *thought* and by heroism of *sentiment*.

544. 4. Historians, who have seriously studied the Middle Ages, remark with reason that, during this long period, the influence of the Church is *the only one that remained standing* and which exercised its empire in the intellectual world. "The ancient world was no more," says the Abbé Ant. Pirenne, "but its literature survived. The Church adopted as her own, Greek and Latin, *the two languages* which had been the instruments of the thoughts and the vehicles of the knowledge of antiquity; in appropriating them she immortalized them; and in immortalizing them she saved the ideas with which they were impregnated, the knowledge of which they had been the receptacle, in a word, *all the intellectual treasure which was gathered in them;* for a language is like running water, which contains in itself all the elements of a people's life." *De l'Eglise dans ses rapports avec le developpement intellectuel* (The Church in her relations with intellectual development). If she had done nothing more than to preserve the treasures of pagan literature, the Church would deserve the thanks of the whole world. At a time when Europe, ravaged by the barbarians, saw all its libraries destroyed, it was the *monks* who saved from fire and pillage those precious manuscripts.

And when every facility for the reproduction of copies was wanting, these same monks, in their cells, or in the Scriptorium of the Monastery, transcribed them by hand and multiplied copies in great numbers. They devoted to this work all the leisure and the time that was not occupied with the education of childhood and youth, the clearing of waste land, the draining of swamps, and the erection of many of those wonderful cathedrals, that cover the surface of Europe and excite the admiration of the astonished tourist. Accordingly, whilst Guizot asserts that the Benedictines cleared the soil of Europe for agricultural uses, the rationalist Gibbon does not hesitate to declare that a single convent of religious men probably rendered greater services to letters than the two Universities of Oxford and Cambridge combined. "An abbey," says Aug. Thierry in his turn, "was not merely a place of prayer and contemplation, it was also a public asylum against the invasion of barbarians. This place of refuge for books and science contained also workshops of every kind, and its lands formed model farms. It was the school of instruction, to which came those of the conquerors, who, animated by a well directed self-interest, were desirous of cultivating and colonizing their domains."

5. And as to the Popes in particular, what have they not done for the progress of human knowledge? "I should never end," says Mgr. Freppel, "if I were to enumerate all the services rendered by the Papacy to the cause of science and letters. I might point out to you a Pope at the head of the revival of Greek and Latin literature; the refugees from Constantinople seeking shelter under the shadow of the Pontifical throne; Lascaris on the Esquiline, next to the palace of Leo X., teaching Greek to astonished Europe; Nicolas V. maintaining a legion of learned men, employed to collect precious manuscripts throughout the world; Pius II., the learned Æneas Sylvius, mingling his own science with the learning of his protégés. And to come nearer to our own times, shall I cite Paul III. encouraging Copernicus in his immortal astronomical discoveries; Gregory XIII. requiring from astronomy[1] a more regular calculation of

[1] A splendid evidence of the successful cultivation of astronomical science under Pontifical patronage was afforded by the correction of

the days and months; Sixtus V. enlarging the Vatican library, which excites the admiration of mankind; Urban VIII., whose Latin poems are justly considered among the best of the kind in modern times, and finally the great Benedict XIV., to whom Voltaire himself rendered homage in saluting in his person the most learned man of the eighteenth century?"

It is an historical fact that at every period of the Christian era, the Papacy has always led the scientific and literary movement, as it was also at the head of the religious and social movement of the world. And here, who does

---

the calendar by the authority of the Sovereign Pontiff, Gregory XIII. (A. D. 1572). By calendar is meant a certain distribution of time adapted to religious and civil purposes, and pointing out the order and procession of the days, weeks, months and festivals of the year. Rome received its first calendar from Romulus and Numa; but this production, owing to imperfect knowledge of astronomy, was full of errors. It was improved by Julius Caesar (B. C. 46), through the distinguished astronomer Sosigenes, whom he called to Rome from Alexandria. He was the author of the Julian Calendar, based upon the principle that the sun moves through the ecliptic (the apparent path of the sun—or the real path of the earth traveling on in its orbit around the sun) in 365 days, and 6 hours. This was a very near approach to the truth, though not perfectly correct; for in reality the sun (or rather the earth) makes its yearly revolution in 365 days, 5 hours, 48 minutes and 57 seconds. Sosigenes thus added eleven minutes to each year, which necessarily involved an error of one day in 134 years, thus making the year eleven minutes longer than it is in reality. In consequence of this difference, apparently trifling, from the time of the Council of Nice (A. D. 325) until the reformation of the Calendar in 1582, the error of computation had reached ten days; so that the vernal equinox, which in 325 was announced to occur on the twenty-first of March, in 1582 fell on the eleventh, though still announced for the twenty-first of that month. This was confusing the time of celebrating Easter, which the Ecumenical Council of Nice, in 325, had decreed should be the Sunday after the full moon following the vernal equinox. To remedy this confusion and produce a more accurate Calendar, Pope Gregory XIII. called to his aid some of the most distinguished astronomers of that age, among whom were Christopher Clavius, a German Jesuit, Peter Chacon, a Spaniard, and Ignatius Danti, an Italian. But the glory of having brought the great work to a successful issue is chiefly due to an Italian astronomer and physician named Luigi Lilio Ghilardi, whose calculations were carefully examined and finally approved by the Commission of Astronomers appointed by the Pope. As the Encyclopedia Brittanica informs us (see article Calendar) the individual who next to Lilio most contributed to give the ecclesiastical Calendar its present form, and who was charged with all the calculations necessary for its verification, was the German Jesuit Clavius, by whom it was completely developed and explained in a great folio treatise of 800 pages, published in 1603. To carry out the needed

not recall to his mind the Pope now gloriously reigning, who, by his learning, his writing and his works, marches at the head of contemporary civilization? No one can be ignorant of the admirable zeal with which Leo XIII. favors and recommends deep and conscientious studies in literature and linguistics, in the natural sciences, in history, philosophy and theology, in holy Scripture, in a word, in all branches of human and divine knowledge.[1] As an evidence of the vigor-

reform the Pontiff suppressed at once from the year 1582, ten entire days (those between the 4th and 15th of October), by which the real or astronomical equinox was in advance of the equinox of the Calendar; thus making them again coincide, and restoring all Christian festivals to their proper time throughout the year. Hence, the 5th of October, of 1582, was reckoned to be the 15th of the same month. But the reform was also directed to insure correctness in the future; and the method adopted was so successful that it would now take 6,000 years to make the difference of a day between the astronomical and the calendar year, and when 6,000 have passed, it will be necessary to intercalate one day more, and then the year will require no correction for 140,000 years more. Strictly speaking, this is a defect, but it will be easy for posterity to remedy it, if the world will reach the end of that long revolution of ages. The reckoning according to the old erroneous Julian Calendar is known as the *old style*, the computation by the correct Gregorian Calendar is the *new style*. It was at once adopted by all Catholic countries, whilst the Protestant nations hesitated more or less in receiving the benefit done to society at large, on the plea as Hallam, himself a Protestant, remarks, that a truth is no longer a truth when promulgated by the Pope. In fact, England refused to adopt it for 170 years, until 1752; Sweden adopted the new style one year later, in 1753; and the German States not until 1776. In Schismatic Russia the Julian Calendar, *old style*, is still adhered to, with the result that their computation of time is twelve days in arrear of the rest of the civilized world; the Russian rulers thus preferring to be at variance with the heavens and the stars, rather than to agree with the Roman Pontiff.

References:

1. Darras—General History of the Church, English edition in 4 vols. Vol. 4, p. 234, n. 5
2. Kenrick, Right Rev. F. P.—The Primacy of the Apostolic See, p. 470.
3. Fredet—Modern History, Note M, p. 522.
4. Brennan, Rev. M. S.—What Catholics have Done for Science, Chronology, p. 40.
5. Catholic Dictionary, p. 99.
6. Wiseman (Cardinal)—Lecture on Church and Science, Feb. 8, 1853.

1 There is, however, one science which Leo XIII. condemns; it is: "That science, which only sees matter, and which assigns eternity to it; the science which lowers man to the level of the brute, and which by its vagaries undermines the foundations of moral, domestic and civil order. There is, also, a civilization repudiated by him; it

ous impulse and helpful encouragement given by the reigning Pontiff to the cultivation of the various fields of knowledge, both human and divine, we here quote the several Encyclical letters and the published briefs bearing on this subject.

1. Encyclical *Aeterni Patris* (4th of Aug. 1879) on Christian Philosophy.

2. Brief *Cum sit* (4th Aug. 1880), proclaiming St. Thomas Aquinas patron of Catholic schools.

3. Brief "*Saepenumero*" (18th Aug. 1883). On the Study of History.

4. Encyclical *Providentissimus Deus* (18th Nov. 1893). On the Study of Holy Scripture.

5. Apostolic Letter *Vigilantiae* (Oct. 30, 1902), appointing a Commission for the study of Sacred Scriptures.

6. Moreover, a recent proof was given by his Holiness of his munificence and fostering patronage of the studies by the acquisition he made of the splendid library of the Barberini Princes at the cost of 600,000 lire. It contains upwards of 50,000 volumes, and a precious collection of 12,000 manuscripts, which, added to those already possessed by the Vatican, constitute a treasure of 42,000 manuscripts, rendering the Vatican library equal, nay superior to all other libraries throughout the civilized world. Besides, all are aware of the fact, most creditable to the Holy See, that by order of Leo XIII. all the Archives of the Vatican are thrown open to the public, a circumstance that brought to Rome the most celebrated scholars of Europe and America, who, availing themselves of the liberal policy of the Pope, transcribe the most valuable documents, and thus enrich their respective countries with the treasures of learning stored up for centuries in the Vatican library. "Nothing can be nobler," says he "than literary glory." Accordingly, he extols the study of Roman letters and of the Greek

is most assuredly not the civilization by which man perfects himself in the three-fold relation to God, to his fellow-men, and to civil society, which we have indicated; to this the Church gives her efficacious concurrence. But it is a civilization that aims at supplanting Christianity, and destroying with it all the benefits with which we have been enriched through it during the space of nineteen hundred years. (Pastoral letter of 1867.)

authors. "The models of Greece," he says on another occasion, "shine forth and so far surpass all others in every kind of literature, that nothing more polished and more perfect can be imagined."

§ II. The Church and the Fine Arts.

545. We can say only a few words on the Church's influence upon the progress of the fine arts, but they mean a great deal. "Suppress in your mind all the monuments of Christian art, from the days of the Catacombs to our times; suppress what remains in public and private collections of the master-pieces of painting and sculpture due to Christian genius and you will have in the remaining scanty remnants the best proof of the truth that the Catholic religion was the sole inspirer of high art, the founder of all the rival schools, the fostering mother of art and artists. It is to the Church and to the Church alone, that belongs the honor of having perfected the beauty of pagan forms, by the still greater beauty of Christian sentiment; ancient art had deified matter, modern art has breathed into it a soul." M. Armengaud, *Les chefs-d'œuvre de l'art chretien* (The Masterpieces of Christian Art). To mention Italy alone, how renowned are the names of the painters who have flourished in the century extending from Leo X. to Urban VIII! Fra Bartolomeo, Leonardo de Vinci, Raphael, Perugino, Andrea del Sarto, Corregio, Giulio Romano, Daniele di Volterra, Michael-Angelo, Palma the Elder, Titian, Paul Veronese, Tintoretto, the Caracci, Guido and Domenichino!

Was it not Canova, the great modern sculptor, that wrote to Napoleon: "All religions nourish art, but there is none of them that does it in the same measure as the Catholic Church?" After a period of lamentable disdain and aberration our century has at last come back to celebrate with enthusiasm and imitate the marvels of architecture, sculpture and painting of the Middle Ages. It rightly admires the grave and moving melodies of the Gregorian chant and the learned compositions of Roland de Lattre, Palestrina and Allegri, of whom, after hearing them in the

Sistine Chapel, a great master said: "I have only listened to the angels and repeated what they were singing."

Whilst the Church was thus giving to souls, with the possession of truth, the sentiment of the beautiful, and was evincing the need of expressing it by the arts, the reformers of the sixteenth century, treating as superstition the rich adornments of the altars, as idolatry the innumerable masterpieces of our Churches, furiously set about destroying the marvels of Catholic art. "The Reformation," says Chateaubriand, "imbued with the spirit of its founder, an envious and barbarous monk, declared itself the enemy of the arts. By stifling the lofty intellectual aspiration of the imagination of man, it clipped the wings of genius and lowered it to the ground. If the Reformation, at its origin, had completely succeeded, it would have renewed, at least for a time, another reign of barbarism and reckless vandalism. By way of contrast, let us hear what two Protestant writers state concerning the influence of the early Reformers on the fine arts. Motley, in his "History of the Rise of the Dutch Republic," vol. 1, ch. vii, speaks as follows: "The Netherlands," he says, "possessed an extraordinary number of churches and monasteries. Their exquisite architecture and elaborate decorations had been the earliest indication of intellectual culture displayed in that country. All that science could invent, all that art could embody, all that mechanical ingenuity could dare, all that wealth could lavish, all gathered around these magnificent temples. And now for the space of only six or seven days and nights there raged a storm, by which all these treasures were destroyed. Art must forever weep over this bereavement. . . . Hardly a statue or picture escaped destruction. The number of churches desecrated (by the fanatical Calvinistic mob) has never been counted. In the single Province of Flanders four hundred of them were sacked."

Prescott, in his "History of Philip II." writes: "The loss occasioned by the plunder of gold and silver plate might be computed. The structures so cruelly defaced might be repaired by the skill of the architect. But who can estimate

the irreparable loss occasioned by the destruction of manuscripts, statuary and paintings? It is a melancholy fact that the earliest efforts of the Reformers were everywhere directed against those monuments of genius, which had been created and cherished by the generous patronage of Catholicism." Not Europe alone, but the whole world is covered with monuments of the Catholic religion. We owe to it the Gothic architecture, which equals, by its details, and surpasses by its grandeur, the monuments of Greece.

546. References:

1. Kenrick, Right Rev F. P.—The Primacy of the Apostolic See Vindicated; ch. vi, p. 476.
2. Hettinger—Apology of Christianity; vol. 5, ch. 19. The Church and Civilization.
3. Maguire, John Francis, M. P.—Rome, its Ruler and its Institutions; ch. xxx. The Fine Arts.
4. Glories of the Catholic Church in Art, Literature and History; edited by Maurice Francis Egan, A. M. LL. D. D. H. McBride & Co., Chicago, 1896.

§ III. The Church and Education.

I.—Popular Instruction.

547. Religious and moral instruction forms the basis of all true civilization, we should indeed say the basis of society itself, which, if it be not founded upon certain fundamental truths admitted and practiced by the masses, is constantly threatened, not only in its prosperity, but even in its very existence. This is especially true in the troubled times in which we live. Victor Hugo himself declared in the National Assembly, January 15th, 1850: "Religious teaching is, in my opinion, more necessary now than ever before. The greater a man becomes, the more he should believe. There is a great evil in our day; I would almost say there is only one evil. It is a certain tendency to limit every thought and aspiration to the present life. If we once assign to man as his only end and purpose of existence the earthly goods of the present life, we aggravate all his miseries by confining his aspirations to the present material

world, which lacks the power required to realize them; this is, in plain language, to turn into the law of despair and hell, what is the law of God and the purpose of suffering according to the principles of Christian Faith. From this follow profound social disturbances. Most assuredly, I am among those who wish to improve, during this life, the material condition of those who suffer; but I do not forget that the first boon is to give them hope; oh, how much our finite miseries diminish when they are relieved by the cheering prospect of infinite hope! Our duty, the duty of all of us, legislators, bishops, priests, writers, is. . . . to raise up to heaven the heads of all, to direct all souls to turn their human aspirations towards a future life, where justice will be done, and reward or punishment allotted according to each one's deserts. Let us cry out: No man shall have suffered unjustly or uselessly. Let us not forget it, let us teach it to all; there would be no dignity in living if we were wholly to die. What lightens labor, what sanctifies work, what makes man strong, upright, wise, good, patient, benevolent, just, humble and grand, worthy of the gift of intelligence, worthy of liberty, is to have constantly before our mind the perpetual vision of a better world, sending forth its bright shining rays of hope across the darkness of this life."

Jean Jacques Rousseau himself has said: "Avoid those men who, under the pretext of explaining nature, implant in the hearts of man desolating doctrines. Overthrowing, destroying, trampling under foot everything which mankind respects, they rob the afflicted of their last consolation in their misery, and they take away from the powerful and the rich the only restraint on their passions; they tear out from the heart remorse for crime, the hopes of virtue; and they boast of being the benefactors of the human race. Never, say they, has truth been prejudicial to men. I believe so with them, and this avowal is, in my view, a great proof that what they teach is not the truth."

There are, however, men who believe otherwise; they blind themselves, they imagine there is salvation for the

people only in human knowledge, in the diffusion of science and letters. Well, if they be honest and sincere, they must acknowledge that even on this ground the Church has merited the gratitude of the friends of humanity.

There is not, indeed, any historical fact more fully proven than that of *the solicitude of the Church for the education of the masses.*

548. 1. In the first place, it cannot be denied but that the preaching of the Gospel is a means of marvelous efficacy for the intellectual culture of the people. Now, this preaching is essential to the Church. "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me," says Jesus, "wherefore He hath annointed me, to preach the Gospel to the poor He hath sent me" (Luke iv, 18); hence, His Apostolic life was a continuous preaching to the multitude. Following His example, His disciples traveled over the world, announcing the truth that enlightens and purifies. "Woe is unto me if I preach not the Gospel" (I Cor. ix, 16), exclaims the Apostle of the Gentiles. The knowledge of the religious truths taught by the Church forms by itself the richest treasury of the intellect. It is said most truly that *the Catechism is the philosophy of the people.* Theodore Jouffroy, one of the representatives of infidel philosophy, was compelled to acknowledge it. This is what he said to a numerous auditory at the Sorbonne, in speaking of that summary of Catholic doctrine: "There is a little book which is taught to children, and about which they are questioned at church; read that little book, which is the Catechism, you will find an answer for all the questions that I have asked, for all, without exception. Ask of the Christian whence comes the human species, he knows it; where it is going, he knows it; in what manner it can reach its destiny, he knows it also. Ask of that poor child why is he on earth, what he will become after death, and he will give you a sublime answer, which he may not as yet fully understand, but which is none the less admirable. Ask of him how the world was created, and for what purpose; why God has placed upon it animals, plants; how the earth was peopled; if by one family

or by several; why men speak many languages, why they suffer, the origin of the world, the origin of species, the destiny of man in this life and in the next; the relations of man with God, the duties of man towards his felowmen, he is ignorant of none of these things, and when he grows to be a man, he will have no hesitation whatever as to natural right, as to political rights, as to international rights, for all these flow clearly and inevitably from the very concept of Christianity. That is what I call a grand religion; I know this from the fact that it leaves unanswered none of the questions which concern humanity." (See n. 266–273.)

549. 2. *Whenever the Church has erected a temple, she has also built a school.* As early as in the first centuries of the Christian era, episcopal schools were erected in each bishopric. This is proven by the Anglican Bingham, in his celebrated work *Ecclesiastical Antiquities*; by the learned Thomassin, in his still better known work, *l'Ancienne et Nouvelle discipline de l'Eglise* (The Old and the New Discipline of the Church), by Launoi, Lingard, Louis Nardi, and a multitude of others. The learned Benedictines, authors of *l'Histoire litteraire de la France* (Literary History of France), say, in giving an account of the state of letters in Gaul during the first centuries: "Wherever particular churches were formed, there Christian schools were likewise established." When they relate how, in the fourth century, "the Church and the Monastic Orders were the parts where the remnants of letters and sciences were saved from shipwreck," they add: "The Cathedral Churches had also their schools, where the same methods of teaching were followed as in the early times." Let us remember that before the triumph of the Church under Constantine, parochial Churches did not exist; there were in these times only bishoprics; it was the bishop, who, with the assistance of a few subordinate priests, ruled directly his rising flock. Later, when dioceses were divided into parishes, *parochial* schools were added to *episcopal* schools.

In his erudite work *L'instruction primaire en France*

avant la revolution (Primary Instruction in France before the Revolution), M. Allain remarks with truth that: "The history of instruction in all degrees, in the later Middle Ages, is solely and entirely the history of the efforts made by the Church to preserve the sciences and civilization, threatened on every side. From the fifth to the twelfth century, the clergy alone interested itself in matters of *education.*" Open any collection of the decrees of Ecclesiastical Councils, and you will see those holy and learned assemblies pre-occupied with the question of teaching and recommending the instruction of the Faithful to the enlightened solicitude of the pastors of souls. As early as the sixth century the Council of Vaison referred to what was then considered as the *ancient example of Italy*, to recall to the memory of the priests of Gaul the rigorous obligation for them to bring up and instruct the youth of the country.

A multitude of other Councils, for instance, that of Aix-la-Chapelle in 787, of Thionville in 805, of Mayence in 813, of Rome in 826, of Paris in 829, of Valence in 855, express themselves in similar terms. The desire or spirit of the Church is fully expressed in the 28th Canon of the 3rd Æcumenical Council of Lateran, in 1178: "The Church of God, like a tender mother, is obliged to see that the poor, who have not sufficient resources in the condition of their parents, be not on that account deprived of the means of learning and making progress in letters and the sciences. Therefore, we ordain, that in all Cathedral Churches there be provided, with a sufficient endowment, a master, who shall be entrusted with the duty of teaching gratuitously the clerics of the Church and all the poor scholars."

550. The Bishops and all persons devoted to the Church were animated with the same spirit, and seconded her efforts. In the eighth century, Theodulf, Bishop of Orleans, who was loved by Charlemagne for his learning and his virtues, enacted the following decree, which was adopted, word for word, in the ecclesiastical regulations of *England* at that period: "That priests shall teach school in towns and country districts, and if any of the Faithful desire to con-

fide to priests their little children to enable them to study letters, let them not refuse to receive and instruct them; but on the contrary, let them teach them in perfect charity. And in instructing children, let them not exact any salary, nor receive anything except what the parents may voluntarily offer, through affection or gratitude." The solicitude of Charlemagne regarding the instruction of his subjects is well known. The Abbot of St. Vandrile, Anségise, writes in his collection of the Capitularies of that great Christian Emperor: "Charles decreed that there should be schools in all monasteries and in all bishoprics, in order that *all the children of freemen as well as the children of serfs*, should learn grammar, music and arithmetic."

It was the same in Germany as in France. In a work, "*L'instruction populaire dans l'Allemagne du Nord*" (Popular Instruction in North Germany), M. E. Rendu, inspector-general of the University of France, expresses himself in these terms in speaking of *the times preceding the Reformation:* "*Catholicism* had filled Germany as well as the rest of Europe with popular schools; it had decreed that the clergy should admit to their schools the children of serfs as well as the children of free men; that every priest having care of souls should give instruction himself or through a clerk; that bishops in their visitations should see to it that schools were opened where none existed; that the pastor of each parish should supply the poor with popular instruction. The Catholic Church had done more; anticipating or forestalling the thought of St. John Baptist de la Salle, the disciples of Count Gerard Groote taught to poor children reading, writing, religion and some mechanical arts. In the Low Countries, where their order was founded, these brothers, in the XIV. century, had carried the light of knowledge and charity along both banks of the Rhine, into Westphalia, Saxony, Pomerania, Prussia, and Silesia. At the same time monasteries of women gave to the young daughters of the people teachers whom the Reformation was to take from them. Thus Catholicism had laid the cornerstone of education for the people as well as for the learned."

After what has been said, there is nothing surprising that in the XIV. century the Council of Trent should have found nothing to change in the work of popular education, and that it was satisfied to crown the edifice of common education by the creation of *preparatory seminaries* for clerics.

The work of popular education was far from having declined during the two following centuries. Before 1789 France, for instance, was covered with schools for popular instruction. Paris alone possessed over five hundred of them. There were schools even in small villages, as is shown by Article 25 in the edict of 1695, expressed in these terms: "Regents, preceptors, masters and mistresses in little villages shall be approved either by the pastors of parishes or by other ecclesiastics who have the right to exercise this office." In 1771, Guy de Rousseau de Lacombe, attorney at the Parliament of Paris, wrote in these terms: "Our last kings combined in their ordinances the enactments of their predecessors and those of the Councils, and finding public schools established almost everywhere, they provided for the maintenance of discipline and regular attendance." "Each parish," says Daniel Jousse, in a treatise written in 1709, "possesses generally *two charity schools* for poor children; one for boys, the other for girls."

In a work of Ch. de Robillard de Beaurepaire, the fruit of patient research, we see that in the ancient diocese of Rouen there were 835 schools for boys and 306 for girls in 1159 parishes visited by Mgr. d'Aubigny. Similar works attest a like solicitude on the part of the Church for the other dioceses of France. "Before the Revolution," says Taine, "primary schools were innumerable." *Les origines de la France contemporaine* (The Origins of Contemporary France)., vol. 1, p. 213.

551. In closing chapter ix entitled: *L'Eglise et l'Instruction primaire* (The Church and Primary Instruction), M. Allain expresses himself in these terms: "Anyone who reads without passion or prejudice these extracts of our old synodical ordinances, will be convinced, we trust, of the

zeal with which the Church of France labored for the spread of primary instruction and of the profound wisdom of the rules that she gave to teachers and pupils. The collection of the diocesan statutes of the last two centuries are an imperishable monument of her devotedness to the interests of popular education; they show to what extent she devoted her energy to this important work and what intelligent care she gave to the subject. Those who dare assert that if anything was done in France for primary instruction, it was without the Church and in spite of the Church, prove evidently that they are absolutely ignorant of her legislation and her works." The facts are so striking that the leaders of the Revolution themselves did not hesitate to proclaim, in the famous preamble to the law of the 18th of August, 1792, that "The Brothers of the Christian Schools have deserved well of their country." This testimony, so free from any suspicion of bias, is in no way astonishing. When St. John Baptist de la Salle died, there were schools of the Christian Brothers established in almost all the provinces of France, and it is known that their teaching was free and gratuitous. Ill affected persons even complained of their two great multiplication. "Our town and villages," "said the magistrates and notables of St. Dié in 1773, "swarm with schools; there is no hamlet that has not its grammarian." All this could not be unknown to those calumniators of the Church who dare say, without the shadow of proof, that the Catholic Faith had dominated in the world for long centuries without ever dreaming of founding primary education.

It will perhaps not be without interest to make known the ideas of Voltaire concerning popular education. From a great number of opinions of the same kind written by this great despiser of the people, we shall limit ourselves to citing the following: "The workman does not deserve to be educated. It is enough for him to handle the spade, the plane or the file." "It is essential that there should be a class of ignorant people." "It is not the common laborers but the citizens that should be educated." As to the ignorant people, "they must be contented to bear the yoke and feel the goad."

II. Superior and Secondary Education.

552. SUPERIOR EDUCATION. No one is ignorant of the fact that *all* the universities, so numerous and so flourishing during the Middle Ages, were, as early as the eleventh and twelfth centuries, founded *by the Catholic Church*, or had sought her confirmation, sanction and protection. No doubt they were likewise encouraged by favors from kings and princes; but it is absolutely undeniable that they grew and prospered under the shadow of the Holy See. In the bulls instituting them the Popes give as one of the motives for their foundation, the duty imposed upon them of dispelling the darkness of ignorance and of encouraging the teaching of all the sciences. As early as the thirteenth century even the oriental languages were taught, and in 1311 the General Council of Vienna made this teaching obligatory in the principal universities. The first collection of documents gathered for the history of natural sciences is due to a Pope, Pius V. (1566-1572), and already in the thirteenth century there existed in the Vatican a botanical and medical garden. (See de Decker op. cit, The Church and the Christian Social Order.)

Whilst the universities received from the Papacy their statutes and their powers, they pointed, with legitimate pride, to such men among their illustrious teachers, as St. Anselm, St. Bonaventure, Alexander de Hales, Albert the Great, Dun Scotus, Peter Lombard and St. Thomas Aquinas.

The number of students was in full proportion to the high standard of learning given in the universities. When in the sixteenth century the Protestant Reformation came and threw all Catholic Europe into wild confusion, there were to be found in the Universities of Zwoll, Bois-le-Duc, Cologne, Deventer, respectively 800, 1,200, 2,000, 2,200 students. The University of Vienna counted 3,000 students and up to 7,000 under Maximilian I.; the University of Paris, it is said, and that of Cracow in Poland had as many as 15,000 students. Owing to the universal use at that period of the Latin language in teaching, each of these universi-

ties saw crowding into its halls students from all parts of the world.

In Belgium, the University of Louvain, founded in the fifteenth century by Pope Martin V., shone forth with great splendor. According to Justus-Lipsius, from seven to eight thousand scholars received its lessons and two thousand were students of law. No poor scholar was ever denied admittance, as Catholic charity had provided for all their wants. There were in that town more than forty colleges or houses intended to lodge and board scholars without fortune, who distinguished themselves by their talents and application. *Histoire du Baianisme* (History of Bainism), by F. du Chesne. Laurentie shows that the single University of Paris had six hundred and nineteen fellowships, founded by the clergy in favor of poor scholars.

553. INTERMEDIATE EDUCATION. As to *colleges*, that is, schools where classical studies were principally pursued along with higher religious instruction, they were to be found even in small towns. Generally the magistrates exercised complete control over them, but almost all the teaching was done by the clergy, who had, moreover, the recognized right of inspection. Here also it was Christian charity that endowed these numerous establishments, that founded scholarships in aid of students and erected public libraries.[1]

It would be interesting to compare the beneficent action of the Church in favor of education with what was done by the *French Revolution*, to which many writers attribute, but very wrongfully, so many excellent things. We have not room in this book for such comparison. It can be found, as far as primary education is concerned, in an article in

[1] These old gratuities or free tuitions on behalf of poor scholars were the result of spontaneous gifts; they were not like the gratuities, which we often witness in our times, too often derisive in their character, as they are made up of the public funds, that is, of the money of the people; at bottom they are but a new form of taxation, exacted from the poor as well as from the rich, under the penalties of the law. Who can reckon the enormous sums expended every year in most of the countries of Europe, for the maintainance of purely secular, godless education in all its degrees!

the *Revue des Questions historiques* (Review of Historical Questions), April, 1880, by Victor Pierre. We shall confine ourselves to stating that the Revolution began, in 1793, by suppressing all primary schools. And how did it replace them? By high-sounding decrees, which did not prevent the learned Chaptal, at that time Minister of the Interior in France, from declaring in 1801: "Public education is almost null everywhere; the generation, which has just reached its twentieth year, is irrevocably sacrificed to ignorance; primary schools exist almost nowhere."

"In 1789 forty-seven per cent. of men and twenty-six of girls or women, could read and write, or at least sign their name. In the last days of the Directory and even in the early times of the Consulate, education was almost null in France, in fact, for the last eight or nine years, it had ceased to be given."—Taine, pp. 213 and 217 of work quoted above (n. 551).

At the time that the Revolution suppressed the schools of the people, it destroyed also the five hundred and sixty-two colleges which existed in France. "Before 1789," writes Albert Duruy, in his remarkable work *L' instruction publique et la Revolution* (Public Instruction and the Revolution), "there were to be found in France, for a population of 25,000,000, five hundred and sixty-two colleges, with 72,747 scholars. Of this number about 40,000 received gratuitous, or almost gratuitous education." "The single college *Louis le Grand*," says Taine, "possessed an income of 450,000 francs. In our day, for 38,000,000 inhabitants, official documents show only 81 lyceums and 325 colleges, with 79,231 students; only 4,949 receive fellowships more or less important. In the single province of Franche-Comté there were more free scholarships than there are to-day in the whole of France. These figures are eloquent and need no commentary." We thus see how truthfully Michel Chevalier was speaking when he said that "since the Revolution and the suppression of the religious orders, France has greatly retrograded as to secondary education."[1] The

1 "Public education by the State, by which the revolutionary Jacobins (both past and present) pretend to replace the old educational es-

reader is fully aware of the fact that the present masonic Rulers of unhappy France are carrying out the atheistic programme of the Jacobins, which desolated France during the Revolution of 1789. In fact, through the barbarous execution of the iniquitous laws against Religious Associations, 3,250 free schools have been recently closed; 10,000 Religious have been expelled from their peaceful homes, in consequence of which drastic measures not less than 200,225 children are now deprived of Christian education.

There is a specimen offered to the civilized world of the liberty granted to their fellow-citizens by the Republican tyrants that now rule, or rather *ruin*, that unfortunate country!

Taine gives the same figures, and he adds that a few years after the Revolution the number of students was reduced to 7,000 or 8,000; moreover, six out of seven students, in place of seeking for a classical education, were preparing themselves for a trade. (T. 1, p. 219). As to the universities, only one, that of Strasbourg, was allowed to continue, and that because of its Protestantism; the other twenty-three were suppressed. Naturally, the possessions and revenues of these establishments were confiscated, and the former body of teachers and professors were dismissed or compelled to apostatize if they wished to retain their positions. It is true that the Empire and succeeding Governments applied themselves to remedy the harm done by the Revolution, but their efforts consisted only in repairing, more or less imperfectly, the ruins accumulated by the blithing doctrines of free thought. Do these laudable efforts confer the right to revile the Church, that for centuries had done far more and far better in the noble cause of education and Christian civilization?

tablishments and the free foundations, figures only on paper. They established a central school for each department, eighty-eight colleges for the territory of ancient France; this hardly takes the place of the eight or nine hundred colleges, all the more from the fact that these new schools can hardly continue to exist, as they are already dilapidated, badly furnished and badly kept. Accordingly most of the courses are deserted."—Taine, *Les origines de la France contemporaine* (Origins of Contemporary France), vol. 1, page 218.

We shall conclude by citing the Protestant historian Hurter in his "History of Pope Innocent III:" "It is only superficial people who have not studied the documents; who are either blinded by the pretended superiority of their times, or impelled by systematic hatred, that would dare accuse the Catholic Church of fostering ignorance and obstructing intellectual culture."

554. We cannot close this chapter better than by citing the eloquent words of Cardinal Baluffi, in which he draws a rapid sketch of the civilizing influence of the Church of Rome, and shows the numberless claims which she has on the gratitude of mankind (p. 445 et seqq.)

"What we stated above is only a brief summary of the innumerable blessings conferred on society by the unceasing and all-embracing charity of the Catholic Church. What has any religion or philosophy, or any form of non-Catholic Government, or the Greek Schismatical Church, or any Protestant sect, done that can bear comparison with the great and innumerable benefits conferred upon the world by the Church of Rome? What foreign nations have they converted? Where have they suppressed slavery in Europe? What cruel and corrupt nation have they regenerated by science and virtue?

"In the Catholic Church religious life was fostered and crowned with success. Monasteries sprang up in every country. Those who were wearied of the world, or desirous of leading a holy life, retired to devote themselves entirely to the service of God. Learning, the arts, and agriculture, were preserved and improved by the peaceful inmates of these sanctuaries of virtue.

"The Catholic religion, founded on truth, is essentially opposed to error, but in condemning it, is merciful toward the erring, ever mindful of what St. Augustine teaches, *Diligite homines, interficite errores* (Love men, but destroy their errors). Persecuted by all classes in the name of toleration, the Catholic Church, though theologically intolerant (n. 430) of every false doctrine, has always been patient, compassionate and charitable toward those that hate her and reject her authority. Like her Divine Author, she makes

no distinction between Samaritan and Jew, Scythian and barbarian, heretic and Catholic, friend and enemy, but has her heart and her hand open to all.

"The charity of the Church goes to far-off lands, bearing a message of truth and love to the rudest and most savage races. As the Father sent his Son, and the Son the Apostles, in like manner does the successor of Peter send to those who live in the shadow of death messages of light. These apostolic men have left permanent monuments of their labors in every country; and, their ranks being renewed from generation to generation, the perpetual mission of the Catholic priesthood is maintained. But what has Russia done for proclaiming the name of Jesus in Africa, Persia, China, Oceanica, or even among the pagans or Mussulmans living in her empire? What has the Oriental Schismatic Church accomplished? What disciples of the Crescent has she withdrawn from the service of the false Prophet? Protestant missions are of very late growth, and the work done is rather of a mercantile than of an apostolic character. The *Word* is preached without risk, and the mode of imparting it is characteristic. It is given wholesale in Bibles, distributed by the thousand to ignorant and illiterate pagans. But there is a worse phase in their history. The emissaries of the Bible Societies often follow upon the track of the Catholic missionaries, and by calumny and bribery mar the good done by them. It is only among the envoys of the Church, having a divine mission, that we find the agents of God's mercy in the conversion of the world (n. 382).

"Grant, O Lord, that the empire of error may come to an end, and that the light of truth may dissipate the darkness in which our separated brethren are involved, and that the heart of your divinely instituted Church may be rejoiced by a return to her fold of those, who still remain deaf to the voice of that authority, which was commissioned to teach all nations."

555. References—1. Baluffi (Cardinal)—The Charity of the Church.

2. Gibbons (Cardinal)—Our Christian Heritage.

3. Schanz (Rev. Paul)—Christian Apology, translated by Rev. Michael F. Glancey, and Rev. Victor J. Schobel, D. D., Pustet, New York, 1896.

4. Balmes—Protestantism and Catholicity Compared, chapter xx., Contrasts Between Two Orders of Civilization.

5. Marshall, T. W. M.—Christian Missions, Their Agents and Their Results.

6. Drane, Theodosia Augusta—Christian Schools and Scholars, or Sketches of Education from the Christian Era to the Council of Trent (A. D. 60–1563). This is, in our opinion, the best work on this subject that we possess in the English language. London, Burns & Oates, 1881.

7. Baron De Haulleville—The Future of Catholic Peoples, p. 154.

8. Young, Rev. Alfred, C. S. P.—Catholic and Protestant Countries Compared, p. 202 et seqq.

§ IV. The Church and Science.

556. Before concluding this last chapter of our work we deem it advisable to add some few remarks to refute the charge, often alleged against the Catholic Church, that she is hostile to the progress of art, literature and science. We shall do so by proving, through the testimony of undeniable historical facts, that the greatest masterpieces in every department of civilized life are the immediate result of her inspiration and fostering care. In fact, all the great discoveries and inventions during the past three centuries, that have exerted the most potent influence in advancing scientific knowledge, are to be credited to the Church and to a galaxy of her devoted loyal children. On the 8th of February, 1853, his Eminence Cardinal Wiseman delivered a lecture before the Catholic Literary Society of Leeds, England, in which he forcibly and eloquently demonstrated the following proposition: "*Science has nowhere flourished more, or originated more sublime or useful discoveries than where it has been pursued under the influence of the Catholic Church.*" Let us here briefly point out the leading historical facts

adduced by his Eminence in support of his thesis. This we shall do by giving the series of useful inventions and their Catholic authors as exhibited in the able lecture here referred to. Facts, it is said, are stubborn things; and it is exactly by the eloquence of facts that we intend to refute the silly and groundless calumny, so often reproduced, of the supposed hostility of the Catholic Church to scientific progress and modern civilization.

As Cardinal Wiseman pertinently remarks, a phenomenon has been before the eyes of mankind perhaps for hundreds, it may be, for thousands of years. It has, during this period passed completely unobserved. At length there comes a happy genius, who seizes upon it, finds in it a truth, principle or law, and thus gives to the world the germ of perhaps a most important discovery. That man is entitled to be considered the inventor or the discoverer, even though what he gives in an imperfect form may afterwards grow up to something much greater in the hands of a second genius, more practical, and, may be, more successful than the first. Now, in both these ways we claim for Catholicity the glory of having given to the world many of its greatest and most important scientific truths, particularly during the last three hundred years. The following catalogue will substantiate our assertion:

1. The Pendulum, or Clock Regulator, Galileo, 1642.
2. Laws of motion, both in solids and fluids, of Attraction, Projection and Gravitation, Galileo.
3. The Barometer, Torricelli, 1647.
4. Spectacles, Lenses, Salvino degli Armati, 1280.
5. Telescope and Microscope, Galileo.
6. Thermometer, Galileo.
7. Double set of nerves in the human body, one for motion and the other for sensation, Bellingeri, recent Physiologist.
8. Discovery of continuous current of electric energy, the foundation of Telegraphy and Telephones, Volta, 1827, and Galvani, 1798.
9. Perfect Catalogue of the Stars, Piazzi, 1788.

10. The Mariner's Compass, invented, or at least perfected by Flavio Gioia of Amalfi, 1302.
11. The Printing Press, Guttenberg, 1436.
12. Dynamic Electricity, A. M. Ampére, 1835.
13. Gunpowder, Schwartz, a monk of Cologne, 1320.
14. Photography, Daguerre and Niepce, 1851.
15. Camera Obscura, Gianbattista della Porta, 1615.
16. Magic Lantern, Father Kircher, S. J., 1680.
17. Electric Lamp, Leon Foucault, 1848.
18. Music Gamut Scale, Guido of Arezzo, 1124.
19. First Electro Motor, Gramme, recent Belgian inventor.
20. Storage Battery, Gaston Planté, recent inventor.
21. Preparation of Illuminating Gas, Minkelers, recent inventor.
22. Hydraulic Press, Pascal, 1662.
23. Torsion balance for accurate measurements, Coulomb, 1806.
24. Laws of Crystallography, Abbé Haüy, 1832.
25. Clocks, joint production of three monks, Gerbert, 999. Pacifico of Verona and Abbot William Hirschau.
26. The First Museum, that of the Vatican in Rome.
27. The First Botanical Garden, Pisa, 1543.
28. The First Newspaper, published in Venice, 1562.
29. The First Scientific Society, Naples, 1560.
30. The First Bank founded in Venice, 1171.
31. The X-Rays, Roentgen, a few years ago, whose brilliant discovery so useful in surgery, is the theme of universal praise.

In the teeth of such evidence, how is it possible that the Catholic Church should have been, or should be called the vigorous and persistent enemy of the highest intellectual life of mankind?

Some Distinguished Catholic Scientists.

I. Astronomy.

557. Regiomontanus, Copernicus, Descartes, Galileo, De Vico, S. J., Grimaldi, S. J., Cassini, Piazzi, Picard,

Secchi, S. J., author of a standard work on the Sun, Denza, Maraldi, Perry, Gassendi, Boscovich, Leverrier the discoverer of Neptune, called the giant of modern astronomy, Castelli, Bianchini, and Plana of Turin, whose three large volumes on the Moon have exhausted the subject and form one of of the most elaborate mathematical works ever published.

II. Botany.

Cesalpino, Jussieu, Charles and Louis Tulasne, Federico Cesi, who suggested the Linnean system of classification.

III. Electricity.

J. B. Biot, Nollet, Carré, Nobili, Melloni, Pacinotti, Caselli, a canon of Florence, who, in 1856, invented the Pantelograph, by which the autographic writings or designs of the sender are transmitted by the electric current. Marconi, the inventor of wireless telegraphy.

IV. Geography.

Columbus, Amerigo Vespucci, Gerard Mercator, Marco Polo, Magellan, Vasco de Gama, Vasco Nuñez de Balboa, Pizarro, Hernando Cortez, Hernando de Soto, La Salle, Father Marquette, S. J., Joliet, John and Sebastian Cabot, James Cortier, Joseph Le Caron, Samuel de Champlain.

V. Geology.

Leonardo da Vinci, Fracastoro, Fabio Colonna, Nicholas Steno, Augustine Scilla, Antonio Vallisneri, Sorignet, Bourgeois, Delauny, Johannes Müller, Donati, Lazzaro Moro, Buffon.

VI. Physics, Chemistry and Mathematics.

Mariotte, J. B. Biot, J. B. Dumas, Chevreul, Mersenne, justly styled the Father of Acoustics, Van Helmont, Bequerel, Lavoisier, Jules Jamin, Latreille, Claud Bernard, Pasteur, A. Cauchy, Chasles, Pascal, Descartes, Moigno, Boscovich, Picard, Pianciani, S. J., A. J. Fresnel, Hermite, Fizeau, Foucault, the discoverer of the velocity of light, which, according to his demonstration, speeds through space at the rate of 186,000 miles every second.

VII. Medicine and Physiology.

Vesalius, Fallopius, Eustachius, called by Cuvier the founders of modern anatomical science, Realdus Columbus, Fabricius, the teacher of Harvey, Spallanzani, Malpighi, Bichat, Francis Redi, Morgagni, Santono, Lancisi, Paré, Desault, Bellingeri, Claude Bernard, Pasteur, Theodore Schwann, the great founder of modern biology, who, by his great discovery, that all living tissues are composed of cells, laid the foundation of true progress in biological science. Other distinguished Catholic scientists of modern times might be mentioned, but the preceding names will be amply sufficient to justify us in concluding that the sceptre of science belongs to the sons of the Catholic Church.

Universities Founded by Catholic Kings and Princes, and Often Under Immediate Papal Inspiration.

558. Oxford, Cambridge, Aberdeen, Upsala, Copenhagen, Paris, Toulouse, Montpellier, Leipsic, Heidelberg, Tübingen, Warzburg, Cracow, Prague, Vienna, Bologna, Padua, Naples, Pisa, Turin, Rome, Salamanca, Seville, Valladolid, Coimbra, Louvain, Catholic University of America at Washington.

Moreover, the introduction of the inductive or experimental method, which gave so many astounding results in the study of natural sciences, is another achievement due to Catholic genius, especially to Roger Bacon, a famous friar, (1294) and Leonardo da Vinci. J. W. Draper, whom no one will accuse of being partial to Catholics, alluding to the latter distinguished scientist, writes as follows: "To him, and not to Lord Bacon, must be attributed the renaissance of science. Bacon was not only ignorant of mathematics, but depreciated its application to physical inquiries. He contemptuously rejected the Copernican system, alleging absurd objections against it. While Galileo was on the brink of his great telescopic discoveries, Bacon in England was publishing doubts as to the utility of instruments in scientific investigations. To ascribe the inductive method to him is to ignore history."

559. The reader is now fully prepared to appreciate the following quotation from Dr. Brownson, vol. VI., p. 547:

"The *Methodist Quarterly Review* for July, 1844, writes: 'Except painting and sculpture, no one of the arts or sciences has escaped the anathemas of Rome.' When and where has Rome ever anathematized any art or science? Music is both an art and a science; has Rome ever anathematized it? Architecture, whether as an art or a science, when has Rome ever anathematized it? We have heard of the Gothic architecture, the admiration and despair of our modern architects, which sprang up in the Middle Ages, and which we have been accustomed to regard as Catholic. Perchance the glorious old cathedrals, of which European tourists tell us so much, were all built by Protestants, and the modern meeting-houses have been designed by Catholic architects! Mechanics is a science; has Rome ever anathematized it? According to the confession of Mr. Whewell, it was completed, so far as it remained for moderns to complete it, by Leonardo da Vinci and Galileo,—for Da Vinci anticipated the discoveries of Stevinus,—both Catholics, and honored at Rome, and the latter a pensioner of the Church. Astronomy, we have seen, owes to Rome its principal discoverers and encouragement. Metaphysics is almost exclusively a Catholic science. Bacon is more than matched by Campanella or Descartes. Leibnitz owed his eminence to his acquaintance with the scholastics, and St. Thomas Aquinas alone will weigh down the whole race of modern German metaphysicians. Italy and France early took the lead in history, and still keep it. In poetry, the Catholics are more than successful rivals of the Protestants. Shakespeare is no Protestant, at least in sentiment. Dante, Petrarch, Boccaccio, Tasso, Ariosto, are all Catholics and Italians. The Spanish and Portuguese poetry is not to be despised; and take away from the poetry of Germany and England what is not Protestant, and neither surpasses France in this department, in which France is poorest. Has Rome ever anathematized logic? If the reviewer believes it, we ask him to read a Catholic course of theol-

ogy,—no matter what one, but any one prepared for young theological students,—and he will very soon change his mind. The truth is, all the great, leading scientific discoveries and inventions of which we boast, Christendom owes to Catholics. Parchment and paper, printing and engraving, improved glass and steel, gunpowder, clocks, telescopes, the mariner's compass, the reformed calendar, decimal notation, algebra, trigonometry, chemistry, counterpoint, equivalent to a new creation in music, are all possessions inherited from our Catholic ancestors. The great maritime discoveries, the discovery of the Cape of Good Hope, and the New World, were all made by Catholics before Protestantism was born. The principle of the steam-engine was discovered by Roger Bacon, and the application of steam to navigation was first made by a Spanish Catholic in the early part of the seventeenth century. The application of the sciences to the industrial arts received its principal developments in Catholic countries, and has made any considerable progress in Protestant countries only since the middle of the last century, that is, since the obvious decline of Protestantism in those countries. And yet, a writer who probably never read a Catholic book in his life, and who, we will venture to assert, cannot state correctly a single distinctive dogma of the Catholic Church, and who proves himself by his reckless assertions utterly ignorant of her history, has the impudence to say, that, excepting painting and sculpture, 'no one of the arts or sciences has escaped the anathemas of Rome!'"

As history and experience teach us, the bitterest accusers and calumniators of the Catholic Church, on the score of her supposed or pretended hostility to literature, learning and science, are generally recruited from the ranks of the successors of the early Reformers, from every sect of the manifold Protestant creeds. Now, not by way of retaliation, which would be ungenerous, but simply to offer a striking contrast, we deem it advisable to call the attention of our readers to the following historical facts based on the statements of three Protestant writers of repute. Mr. W.

Dunn Murray, in his annals of the Bodleian Library, relates the following facts: "Oxford, as Gladstone writes, (Nineteenth Century, March, 1890), had received noble gifts for her university library. And we have to recollect, with shame, that that institution (the university library), was plundered and destroyed by the Commissioners of the boy King, Edward VI., acting in the name of the Reformation of Religion. The Reformers, under pretence of rooting out Popery, superstition and idolatry, utterly destroyed two noble libraries at Oxford, and embezzled, sold, burnt or tore to pieces all those valuable books, which their founders had been so diligent in procuring in every country of Europe. Whole libraries were destroyed by the Reformers, or made waste paper of, or consumed for the vilest uses. Froude, alluding to the same reckless destroyers, says: "Missals were chopped in pieces with hatchets, college libraries plundered and burned."

Maitland in his classical work, "The Dark Ages," sixth edition, p. 319, note, states the following facts, taken from the writers he there quotes. "To return to the royal delegates, they were found doing such things as did not at all become those who professed to be learned and Christian men. For the principal ornaments, and at the same time, supports of the University, that is, the libraries filled with innumerable works, both native and foreign, they permitted or directed to be despoiled. Hence, a great multitude of manuscripts were adjudged to the flames, or to the vilest purposes. The mischief committed at this time can scarcely be conceived. I have seen several fine old chronicles and volumes of miscellaneous literature mutilated, because the illuminations were supposed, by the reforming inspectors, to represent popes and saints, when they were really intended for the portraits of kings and warriors; nay, some were actually mathematical figures! The motive of these barbarians was only equaled by their ignorance. (Editor of the Athenae of Anthony Wood, p. 468.) If the descendants of the sixteenth century vandals were to reflect on the doings of their ancestors, they would soon find out that the enemies of learning, literature, science and pro-

gress were not the Catholic builders of universities, and the founders of their libraries, but their ruthless destroyers, the disciples of Luther, Calvin and Henry VIII.

THEOLOGICAL STUDIES.—It is admitted on all hands that the excellence of any scientific knowledge is principally derived from the nobility and loftiness of the being that forms its object. Judged by this standard, Theology, the Science of the Deity, is, no doubt, the most excellent, as well as the most useful, of all the sciences that may engage the intellect of man. Universal nature, that is, every being distinct from God, is only the footstool of the Divinity, and not itself a god, before which man should lie prostrate in adoration. Now to know the zeal, energy, ardor, and, I might say, the enthusiasm, with which that noblest of sciences, Theology, has been cultivated under the inspiration and auspices of the Catholic Church, we need but call to mind the astounding fact that from the year of the Christian era 1109, when theological studies began to be systematically pursued, to the year 1894, there flourished within her fold not less than 12,208 theological writers. This statement the reader can easily verify by consulting that most valuable work of Fr. H. Hurter, S. J., entitled Nomenclator Litterarius, in four volumes, in which the author gives us, as the result of his indefatigable labors, the literary history of Catholic Theology, from the beginning of the Middle Ages down to the present time. (B. Herder, St. Louis, Mo.) Is there anything outside of the Catholic Church that can compare with this brilliant array of theological writers? We might allege a similar array of Catholic writers in all the branches of Mental Philosophy, which in excellence ranks next to Theology, and is as far superior to all natural sciences as mind is superior to matter.

But our limits do not permit us to proceed, and we must hasten to conclude. That great statesman and scholar, the late W. E. Gladstone, expresses in one sentence all that might be said on the present subject, when he declares that, "since the first three hundred years of persecution the Roman Catholic Church has marched for fifteen hundred

years at the head of human civilization, and has driven, harnessed to its chariot as the horses of a triumphal car, the chief intellectual and material forces of the world; its art, the art of the world; its genius, the genius of the world; its greatness, glory and grandeur and majesty have been almost, though not absolutely, all that in these respects the world has had to boast of."

560. References. 1. Desmond, H. J.—Mooted Questions of History, ch. 9, 11, 16.

2. Brennan, Rev. M. S.—What Catholics Have Done for Science. New York, Benziger Brothers, 1898.

3. Zahm, Very Rev. Dr. C. S. C.—What the Church Has Done for Science. Notre Dame, Indiana.

4. Lodiel, Rev. P. D., S. J.—No. 1, Nos Raisons de Croire (Our Reasons for Believing), ch. vi.

5. Vaughan, Most Rev. R. B.—Science and Religion.

6. Ronayne, Rev. F., S. J.—Religion and Science Historically Considered.

7. Kenrick, Most Rev. F. P.—The Primacy of the Apostolic See, part 3, Literary and Moral Influence.

8. Brownson (Vol. 9)—Scientific Theories.

General Conclusion of This Work.

561. All honor to the Catholic Church, our mother, who, after having saved humanity from the deluge of corruption, in which it had been plunged by Paganism, raised it up a second time from the ruins accumulated by the invasion of the barbarians! All honor to the Church who has *known how* to mould and cement together in such an admirable manner the gross elements placed under her hands by the irruption of the primitive German hordes and other barbarians; by fusing these new people with the ancient population, the Church formed the modern nations, whose civilizations throw so much splendor upon the whole world! All honor to the Church, whose history never ceases to proclaim the beneficent action she exerted on behalf of mankind during the course of nineteen centuries down to our days! That which she has done in the past by her doctrine, her laws, her institutions, and the divine

grace, which she communicates to the souls of the Faithful, the Church can, and desires, to realize once more, for she has lost nothing of her fecundity and immortal youth.

And yet, notwithstanding her immense and incalculable services, the Church remains subject to innumerable attacks. Freemasonry, combining all the forces, of which the enemies of Jesus Christ can dispose, would fain at last give the lie to the prophetic words which promised immortality to the divine work.

We need have no fear as to the fate of Holy Church. Listen to what the illustrious St. Augustin, as far back as fourteen centuries ago, said on this subject: "They see the Church and they say, 'She is about to die; soon her very name will disappear; there will be no more Christians; they have had their day.' Whilst they are thus speaking I see these very men die themselves, day by day, and the Church stands forth proclaiming the power of God to all succeeding generations."

562. In his turn the celebrated Protestant essayist, Lord Macaulay, says: "The Papacy remains not in decay, not a mere antique, but full of life and youthful vigor. Nor do we see any signs which indicate that the term of her long dominion is approaching. She saw the commencement of all the Governments, and of all the ecclesiastical establishments, that now exist in the world. She was great and respected before the Saxon set foot on Britain, before the Franks had passed the Rhine, when Grecian eloquence still flourished at Antioch, when idols were still worshipped in the Temple of Mecca. And she may still exist in undiminished vigor when some traveler from New Zealand shall, in the midst of a vast solitude, take his stand on a broken arch of London Bridge to sketch the ruins of St. Paul." (Review of Ranke's History of the Popes.)

Assuredly, the divine promises authorize us to look to the future with confidence. The Church may be persecuted, as her divine Founder and Master, for she is the *militant* Church on earth; whole kingdoms may even lose the ines-

timable benefit of Catholic Faith. But what she may lose on the one hand, Providence returns to her on the other.

As Bossuet remarks in his famous discourse on Universal History: "The Catholic Church is, no doubt, often subject to severe trials. But what matters it, after all, if a few rotten branches are torn from her? Her vigor is not thereby destroyed. She puts forth from her living trunk other branches, and the pruning of the useless wood only serves to improve her fruits."

"The study of the Catholic system," says Ernest Naville, Protestant professor, of Geneva, 1839, "clearly convinces us that it is logical, that it is beautiful, that the foundations, upon which it rests, are deeply rooted in human nature. I am persuaded that any one can sustain victoriously this dilemma: Either Jesus Christ did not establish a Church, or if He did, the Catholic Church is the one He established."

What, indeed, is now occurring under our own eyes? Whilst persecution, stirred up by the Masonic sects, is let loose against her, the Roman Church sees the bonds of her indestructible unity growing around her more firmly and closely than ever; now more than ever before the voice of the Sovereign Pontiff is heard with ever increasing veneration, docility and love by the Pastors and the Faithful. Abroad the Gospel, far from tending to disappear, on the contrary extends each day its peaceful conquests. The work of distant foreign missions, interrupted by the disturbances of the last century, has received in our day a new and extraordinary impulse. The annals of the Propagation of the Faith are there to attest the marvels of contemporary apostolate in countries of Africa unexplored before our times, as well as in the most savage islands of Oceanica, in the very center of Islamism, as well as in the midst of Asiatic idolatry. And to cite but one fact, whilst at the time of the 2d Plenary Council of Baltimore in 1866 there were in the United States but seven Archbishops and thirty-seven Bishops, there met not long ago (1884), in that same city and for the same purpose, fourteen Archbishops and seventy-five

Bishops. Such in a few years is the progress of the Faith in a single country!

And again, the very sufferings of the Church are a reason for greater confidence in the future, for the Church is the living image of Jesus Christ; the Savior Himself had to pass through the agony of Gethsemane to attain the glory of His triumphant resurrection. *Oportuit Christum pati et ita intrare in gloriam suam.* (Acts, xvii, 3.)

The life of the Church will therefore be in the future, as in the past, a perpetual alternative of combat and triumph until that day marked by Providence will shine forth, when, leaving the arena, which has seen so many glorious struggles, she will introduce the last of the elect into the heavenly Jerusalem.

On that great day of joy and glory shall we be among the children of the Church *triumphant?* Shall we have a part in the boundless and endless happiness, which God has prepared from the beginning for His beloved children? Yes, such shall be our lot if in our short pilgrimage in this world we shall have remained true to the Church, our mother, by the profession of Faith and the performance of good works; if with the Church we shall have bravely labored, struggled and suffered for the cause of God; if with our last breath we can truthfully repeat those words of St. Paul: "I have fought the good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the Faith. For the rest, there is laid up for me a crown of justice, which the Lord, the just Judge, will render to me in that day, and not to me only, but to them also who love His coming." (II Tim. iv, 7.)

THE END.

A. M. D. G.

REV. JAMES J. GALLAGHER.

Additional Notes.*

NOTE A. (p. [83] Vol. I.)

Agnosticism.

"Of all modern "isms," Agnosticism has least claim to originality; and, though bearing a Greek name, is the most unscholarly form of unbelief that has yet appeared. Pantheism, atheism, and all heresies, philosophical and religious to be understood and adopted, require some learning; but to be an agnostic needs only "not to know." Hence it is not original, since ignorance is one of the oldest things in the world; and it is most unscholarly, because the more ignorant one is, the more agnostic he is.

The agnostic rejects the supernatural as "unknowable." He does not say with the atheist, "there is no God," but says, "there may be, but I do not know that there is." He does not deny the existence of the soul and future life, but says that they are outside the sphere of experience, and, therefore, "unknowable."

That we do not know God, the soul, and future life, visibly and tangibly, as we know the material world, is true; but does that fact prevent our knowing of their existence? There are things in the world, of which we know nothing more than that they exist, e. g., magnetic force, gravity, electricity, etc. To know only the fact of God's existence is all-sufficient to prove supernaturalism; and of that fact we have knowledge with certainty. It is not the alternative of knowing or not knowing the supernatural that perplexes the agnostic; it is his inability to know them by "experience." Because he cannot know supernatural truths by the evidence of his senses, he denies that they can be known at all. The absurdity of such an assertion is self-evident.

To know is an act of the intellect and not of the senses. Knowledge is the intellectual possession of the truth of things. The intellect is the supreme faculty of mind which alone, of all our faculties, is capable of knowing or recog-

*Additional Notes developing the subjects referred to in the text.

nizing truth. In searching for truth the intellect uses, as instruments, the senses, reason and testimony. These are to the intellect what the telescope and mathematical instruments are to the astronomer. The agnostic sets too much value upon sensible experience, and ignores reason and testimony. The surgeon who "found not the soul in using his lancet" was a good agnostic; but, if his surgery was no better than his reasoning, he was only a quack. The senses report to the intellect only the presence and qualities of material objects. Reason abstracts their truths, and disentangles truth from error. The intellect does not accept the evidence of the senses until it has tested it by the analysis of reason. In fact, sensible experience, so trusted by the agnostic, is the least reliable instrument of the intellect. The mirage, legerdemain, and the many illusions, to which the senses are liable, prove that. The phrase, "knowledge is of things we see," is misleading, because ambiguous. It is true only of things seen with the mental vision of the intellect, and not of things seen with the bodily eyes. The ignorant sees the stars, only the astronomer knows them. Moreover, abstract truths cannot be apprehended at all by the senses. Does the agnostic say that, therefore, they are not "knowable?" On the contrary, logical deductions from sure and certain premises, give us knowledge with certitude. The demonstrations of the exact sciences, though unrecognizable by the senses, give to the intellect certitude so irresistible, that even a willing doubter cannot deny it. Hence "knowable" truths are not those of sensible experience only, but are all truths apprehensible by the intellect, whether through the senses or through the operations of reason. It is always and only the intellect that knows, no matter what instrument it uses—senses, or reason, or testimony. It is the X-ray of intellect alone that penetrates things and recognizes their verities, and gives us knowledge and certitude.

If facts were not "knowable" except by our sensible experience, we should have to exclude from our store of knowledge all history and all the accepted facts of astronomy, of geology, of chemistry, and of all the sciences, of which we are not experts ourselves. With his principle the agnostic

cannot be sure of the existence of countries, that he has not visited, nor of living celebrities, whom he has not seen. But, happily, the agnostic is inconsistent, for he accepts the facts of history and of science, though, according to his principle, they are to him "unknowable." It is supernatural truths only that the agnostic judges by his criterion. Practically he is an atheist, but more illogical. For while he admits that supernaturalism may be true, he acts as if certain that it is false. In this he is not only irrational, but is also unwise; for in matters of great importance, the wise, when uncertain, always choose the safer side.

But supernatural truths are apprehensible by the intellect, and are, therefore, "knowable." Though we cannot see God with our bodily eyes, the intellect sees in Nature uncontradictable proofs of His existence and of His intelligence. We know that a book is the work of an intelligent author, though we may have never seen him; and we know something of his intellectual powers from that which he has written. Is not the fact of his existence—past or present—"knowable" to the agnostic? Does he not recognize in his work that the author was an intelligent being? In like manner Nature proves the existence and intelligence of the Mind that planned it. The old argument of "design" can never be ignored nor refuted. The human intellect, seeing design—the work of mind—in the Universe, recognizes the existence of its intelligent Designer. Is it rational even to suppose it possible that any blind, mindless force has constructed this well planned Universe? Can any sane mind believe that animal organisms are the hap-hazard production of some mindless cause? The agnostic believes only what is vouched for by his "experience;" has his experience ever known anything that was organized without a thinking organizer? Truly it is infinitely easier and wiser to be a believer in God than it is to be an unbelieving agnostic.

The existence of God is, of course, the foundation truth of supernaturalism. That admitted, the other truths of supernatural religion are easily "knowable" to a healthy mind. The search light of intellect reveals God not only in Nature, but in the history of the Jews, vouched for by their

presence to this day, by their sacred Scriptures, by their ancient cities and tombs, by pagan historians, and by archaeological discoveries. The coming of Christ, so long foretold and expected, fulfilling, so exactly, a long line of prophecies and traditions of both Jews and Gentiles: His superhuman wisdom; the fulfillment of His own prophecies; the successful founding of His unworldly Religion, in the very home of His enemies and executioners; the propagation of His Religion, so repugnant to human passions, and by means so utterly hopeless of success,—according to man's wisdom—the overthrow of mighty paganism by twelve poor, powerless men of a despised race—all prove to the reasoning mind that Christ is another revelation to man of Nature's God, and that supernaturalism is undeniably "knowable."—(*An excellent exposure of the absurdities of Agnosticism by Rev. James McKernan. See his work entitled, "Forty five Sermons Written to meet Objections of the Present Day," from which this short essay has been taken. Fr. Pustet & Co., 1901, New York.*)

References:

1. Spalding, Right Rev. J. L.—Religion, Agnosticism and Education.

2. Lucas, Rev. George J.—Agnosticism and Religion, Christian Press Association, New York, 1895.

3. Ronayne, Rev. M., S. J.—God Knowable and Known.

4. James Ward, Sc. D.—Naturalism and Agnosticism, in two volumes, 1899, McMillan, New York.

NOTE B. (p. 66 and 104, Vol. I.)

A Specious Objection Splendidly Refuted.

From the "Review," edited by A. Preuss, No. 39, Oct. 9, 1902, p. 614.

Mr. W. H. Mallock, in his recent work, "Doctrine and Doctrinal Disruption"—which the Paulist Father Wyman, in the August *Catholic World*, deems the most remarkable book on religious controversy since Newman's "Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine," makes many splendid pleas in favor of Catholicism. Meanwhile Catholics

wonder why he has remained, for a quarter of a century, a luminous sign-post pointing the way to the Church and entering not. In this last work of his he seems to proffer an excuse for his illogical immobility. Since the objection is one that has probably suggested itself to many an intelligent outsider, we will quote it here, together with a masterly refutation of it by the *Northwest Review* (No. 49).

"Doubtless," Mallock writes, "as knowledge widens, it reveals to us aspects of things which make such a response difficult. The apparent insignificance of this earth as compared with the rest of the Universe, the enormous antiquity of mankind as compared with the Christian centuries, the evanescent character of mankind as measured by cosmic time, all tend to paralyze the action of Faith, and to interfere with the idea that the Creator of all the world died for the sake of a swarm of ephemeral animals crawling for a moment on the surface of this paltry pillule."

Now for the refutation:

Mr. Mallock here states, in his customary vivid way, a difficulty that underlies much of the unbelief of our age, and is peculiarly adapted to the shallow mental attitude of an age, in which imagination passes for intellect. For this objection strikes the imagination far more than it impresses the reason. Mr. Mallock himself admits that the insignificance of this earth is only "apparent." True, the size of this earth, as compared with the rest of the Universe is insignificant, but reason is not wont to measure the significance of things by their size; else a whale should be deemed more important than the brain of a Shakespeare, a ton of coal more valuable than the Koh-i-noor diamond. Now the only part of the Universe, which we know at all in detail, is our solar system, and of this system the only body, which we know to be suitable to varied forms of life, is our planet, and surely animate matter is far superior to inanimate creation, an atom of the former is worth worlds of the latter. Doubtless conjecture has run rife as to the possible existence of other inhabited worlds, but Father Searle, the Paulist astronomer, proved some years ago in the *Catholic World* that no other known planet, not even Mars, offered condi-

tions of tempered heat and cold such as to warrant any likelihood of its being the abode of life, at least for organized beings constituted as we are.

Mr. Mallock speaks of "the enormous antiquity of mankind as compared with the Christian centuries." That "enormous antiquity" is mainly imaginary. The late Sir William Dawson, who knew all about "Fossil Men"—and nothing new has come to light on this subject since he wrote that book—saw no reason to place the origin of man farther back than Archbishop Ussher's four thousand years before Christ; and though Catholic apologists, with a better knowledge of the uncertainties of Scripture chronology, may be willing to concede double that length of time, a concession which recent discoveries in Egypt may make advisable, yet the dates which contemporary archaeologists complacently affix to their finds, are extremely uncertain and mainly imaginary. There remain, therefore, only two props to the "enormous antiquity of mankind," the fanciful chronology of archaeologists dealing with remote periods in which points of comparison are conspicuously absent, and the still more unreliable guesses of prehistoric anthropology. (See nn. 180–185 in Christian Apologetics, vol. I.)

Moreover, Mr. Mallock seems to forget that the "Christian centuries" were foreshadowed at the very dawn of the human race. He should take the Christian view in its entirety, as he finds it, and, considered thus, the "Christian centuries" were foretold to Adam when the Redeemer was promised; so that, in a very real sense, the Catholic Church dates back to our first parents, from whose day till the birth of Christ there always were human beings, for whom the hope of His coming was the solace of their lives.

"The evanescent character of mankind as measured by cosmic time" is by no means clear. Can the character of man be called "evanescent" when the soul, to which he owes his character, is immortal? If cosmic time is to measure the character of mankind, it will have to be applied over and over again for all eternity. Cosmic time will one day be no more, and after that the soul's eternity will be entire. Plainly, the shoe is on the other foot. The single

soul of one new-born baby can "knock spots out of" cosmic time. What do we know of cosmic time except that it had a beginning and will have an end? The human soul has had a beginning, but it will have no end. (See nn. 111–124 in Introduction.)

No; the Creator of all the world did not die "for the sake of a swarm of ephemeral animals crawling for a moment on the surface of this paltry pillule." The phrase is a sensational one, hardly worthy of Mr. Mallock, and, what is more, it represents a manifest error. We are not "ephemeral animals;" even the animal part of us will rise again and endure forever; nay, we are the conscious sons of God and the heirs of His Kingdom.

Imaginary then is this difficulty of Mr. Mallock in the double sense of being, first of all, largely fictitious, and, secondly, of impressing the imagination at the expense of the intellect. The imagination is easily startled by mere size, bigness, vast numbers. The intellect views with awe nothing but real greatness, great truths, great ideas. In comparison with the infinitely beautiful idea of the Word made flesh, it sets as little store by a million double stars as it does by a wilderness of apes; both are nothing compared to that divine idea.—(See also *Irish Ecclesiastical Record* for Nov., 1902, and Feb. 1903, on the question, "Is our Earth alone inhabited?")

NOTE C. (page 306, Vol. I.)

Theosophy—Its True Character.

"The leading feature of Theosophic teaching seems to be its attempt to gather together every possible form of religion under the all embracing shelter of its universal brotherhood. Like ancient Rome, it invites the gods of every creed to take their place in its imaginary Olympus, if only they will relinquish their claim to an absolute and unlimited supremacy, and will fall down and worship the Unknown Reality, from which it asserts that they have all emanated, and into the bosom of which they are destined finally to return. Theosophy declares that there is nothing in its

teaching that may not be accepted alike by Buddhist and Hindoo, by Christian or Mahommedan, Jew and Infidel; and it boasts that it contains in itself, in higher and nobler form, all the truth of which the various religions of the earth are the imperfect and partial expression.

This attempt to reconcile the irreconcilable, and to assimilate doctrines that are in direct contradiction with each other, however plausible it may appear at first sight, is in itself the death warrant of Theosophy. It sets logic at nought, and compels him who accepts it, to deny to human reason the power of attaining to truth. Such a system must either perish by internal strife, or else compel its adherents to put aside all that they previously held to be true, in order to remain faithful adherents of no other teaching than its own. Thus Theosophy professes to find room within its fold for the Monotheist; but as it is a system of unmixed Pantheism, the Monotheist, who joins the Theosophic body, must, if he remains a believer in One Personal God, hold opinions inconsistent with each other. In the end he must either abandon his Theism or his Theosophy. In the case of Christianity the contradiction is still more obvious. It is a simple absurdity for a man to call himself a believer in Jesus Christ, if he regards Him as merely a Theosophic adept, in no way superior to Buddha and Confucius.

As regards the beginning and end of all things, Theosophy is, as we might expect, a system of nescience. How the Universe came into being, and whence was derived the primitive tradition, which is the source of Theosophic teaching, are mysteries that Theosophists do not pretend to solve, at least for the benefit of mankind at large. They fall back on the suspicious assertion that all such knowledge is reserved for those who after long ages, have attained, by means of innumerable reincarnations, to a state of Theosophic perfection. If ever one of these heroes of humanity should appear among us, we may be more ready than at present to accept his teaching. But as long as the "Great souls" instead of manifesting themselves to mankind, choose for the medium of their communication per-

sons of the type of Madame Blavatsky and her friends, they can scarcely expect us to regard them as teachers come from God, or look upon the doctrines, that come to us through channels such as these, as something superhuman and Divine.

I have in several passages in the following pages spoken of Theosophy as being a "new system." As a system professing to embrace all possible religions it is certainly new, though the great body of its teaching is but a *réchauffé* of Oriental mysticism. But it is impossible to identify it either with Buddhism or the Brahmanism, on which Buddha founded his sceptical and destructive teaching, or with any of the time-honored religions of the East. We may indeed call it with some truth a nineteenth-century Buddhism, but we imagine that the cultivated Buddhists of India would have the same contempt for it that, according to the testimony of a recent traveler, is entertained by the Lamas of Thibet.

Considerable space has been devoted by some writers to Theosophic marvels, yet it is only right to remind the reader of the comparatively small importance attached by educated Theosophists to the physical wonders wrought by its adepts. It is the body of positive teaching that they regard as all-important. To make the truth of the system turn on the reality of certain prodigies worked through the agency of Madame Blavatsky, would be as reasonable as to regard the truth of Christianity as depending on the reality of some isolated group of mediæval miracles, attributed to a somewhat questionable Thaumaturgist. If we are to refute Theosophy, we must show that its theories are baseless, and not only baseless, but opposed to right reason. We must examine the doctrines taught, and from their character ascertain whether they are such as proceed from the source of all truth, or from the fount of error; and this determined, we have to decide accordingly as to the efficient cause of the preterhuman marvels that certainly accompany it, which, in this and similar instances, cannot but be evil spirits. (See Apologetics, n. 210, vol. I.)

POSTSCRIPT :—I have just received a number of pam-

phlets and letters, having for their object to show that Theosophy is nothing else than an imposture. I have read most of them with care, and they have confirmed the opinion, stated more than once, as the conclusion I had already arrived at, that there is mixed up with Theosophy a good deal of deception, that Madame Blavatsky was a clever and a most unscrupulous person, who did not hesitate to practice various tricks upon her dupes (the "flap-doodles," to use her own word descriptive of them), and had no little contempt for most of those who joined the sacred circle of the Theosophists. But at the same time I am also strengthened in the conviction that there remains, when we have made the largest possible allowance for the presence of a large amount of mere trickery, a considerable residue of phenomena, which cannot be accounted for by any except preternatural agencies.

One very strong impression left by the perusal of this "esoteric" Theosophical literature is a low estimate of the moral standard of the Theosophic Confraternity. Without going so far as a writer in *The Key*, who says: "The nucleus of Universal Brotherhood (and Sisterhood) I found was a hot-bed, a very dung-heap, of all the evil passions," [1] it must be confessed that the leading members of the school are not remarkable for very high aims or exalted virtue. The general temper prevailing among them, the quarrels, the mutual recriminations and accusations of ignorance, knavery and imposture, and charlatanism and avarice, teach us that "Isis unveiled" does not promise to be a very attractive deity. Their talk about purity and asceticism must be received with caution, when we find them sadly deficient in the more ordinary virtue of mutual charity, and rife with internal dissensions. "By their fruits you shall know them," and, judged by this standard, it is hard to see how any one who has a high moral standard can possibly be attracted to the teaching of Theosophy.—*Rev. R. F. Clarke, S. J.*

(See his very able exposure of this new fad in his pam-

[1] *The Key*, September, 1891, p. 43.

phlet entitled: "Theosophy—Its Teaching, Marvels and True Character." Benziger Bros., New York, 1892.)

NOTE D. (p. 411, Vol. II.)

Extracts from "Errata of the Protestant Bible."

A treatise showing some of the errors to be found in the English translations of the Sacred Scriptures, used by Protestants, against such points of religious doctrine as are the subject of controversy between them and the members of the Catholic Church.

BY THOMAS WARD, ESQ.

Extract from the Preface of the Fourth Edition.

BY DR. LINGARD.

The publication of Ward's "Errata to the Protestant Bible" has disclosed a most curious and important fact, that the *scriptural* church of England and Ireland was originally founded on a false translation of the Scriptures. It was the boast of the first reformers, that they had emancipated their disciples from the shackles of Catholic despotism, and had restored to them the freedom of the children of God: it now appears, that this freedom consisted in reading an erroneous version of the inspired writings, and in venerating as the dictates of eternal Wisdom the blunders of ignorant or interested translators. "The Scriptures," they exclaimed, "are the sole rule of faith. Here they are, no longer concealed under the obscurity of a learned language, but exhibited to you in your native tongue. Here you will easily detect the errors of Popery, and learn the true doctrine of the Gospel." The credulity of multitudes accepted with joy the proferred boon; the new teachers were hailed as apostles commissioned by Heaven, and every old creature, both male and female, that could read, became an adept, if not in the knowledge of the Bible, at least in the prejudices and errors of its translators.

It is not for man to dispute the wisdom of Providence, and arraign at the bar of his private judgment the means which God may choose for the diffusion of religious knowledge. Otherwise, I must confess, there appears to be some-

thing very unaccountable in the scriptural blunders of the apostles of the reformation. The object, they said, of their mission was the dissemination of evangelic truth. If the Holy Spirit selected them for this important office, He must also have gifted them with the true knowledge of the Scriptures, and, if He gifted them with the true knowledge of the Scriptures, it seems to follow that He ought also to have granted them the power to make a true translation of the Scriptures. The apostles of Jesus received the knowledge of tongues, that they might instruct the different nations of the earth: the apostles of the church of England and Ireland ought to have received the knowledge of, at least, the Hebrew and Greek tongues, that they might form an accurate version of the Scriptures. However, the fact is certain, not only from the arguments of Ward, but even from the concessions of his adversaries, that the fathers of this *scriptural* church gave it a version of the Scriptures abounding with errors. And here it may reasonably be asked, whence arose these errors? Were they the offspring of ignorance or design? Ward, in his essay, shows that the more important of their errors were committed by design; and a curious circumstance it is, highly corroborative of his opinion, that most of their blunders are favorable to their own peculiar doctrines, and unfavorable to those of their opponents. But, if this be true, what judgment can any unprejudiced man form of these saints of the reformation? For my part, I know of no crime more foul in its own nature, more prejudicial in its consequences, more nearly allied to diabolical malignity, than that of designedly corrupting the holy Scriptures, and, by such corruption, leading the sincere inquirer into error, and converting the food of life into the poison of death.

But from whatever source these false renderings proceeded, whether their authors were guided by policy or misled by ignorance, this must be conceded, that if Ward has fairly established the fact, he is entitled to the gratitude of the impartial reader. The impartial reader, let him be Protestant or Catholic, will, if his object be truth, thankfully receive the truth from whatever hand it may be pre-

sented. Hence it was with no small surprise that I heard the clamour that was raised against the last edition of the "Errata." In parliament and out of parliament, in newspapers and pamphlets, it was stigmatized as an attempt to vilify the reformation, and to heap disgrace on the Established Church. "It was the work," observed an eminent senator, eminent for the only talent he possesses, that of religious calumny, "it was the work of one hundred and twenty Popish priests leagued to put down Protestantism." Such nonsense hardly deserves notice. If facts are to be hidden from the eye of the public, because they reflect on the character of our predecessors, let history at once be condemned to the flames. The evangelists did not conceal the treachery of Judas: why should Protestant divines wish to conceal the blunders or the frauds of the fathers of their church?

To me, it appears, that none among the adversaries of Ward have had the courage, or the honesty to do justice to that writer. His object in compiling the "Errata" was twofold: firstly, to prove that the versions on the Scripture, on which the established creed was originally founded, were extremely corrupt; and secondly, to show that though many errors have been since corrected, there still remain many others to correct. All this however they prudently overlook; and by an artful confusion of times and persons, by referring to modern Bibles the charges which he makes against those of a former age, and by affecting to consider his accusation of the clergy of Queen Elizabeth as directed against the clergy of the present reign, they pretend to convict him of misrepresentation and calumny. In this, perhaps, they may act wisely; they certainly act unfairly. Could they have shown that Ward had attributed to the ancient English Bible errors which it did not contain, or that he had attributed to the present Bible errors which have been corrected in them, they might have substantiated their charges against him. But this they have not attempted. They content themselves with exclaiming that many of the former corruptions have been corrected, and therefore should not have been mentioned. But why should they

not? The very fact of their having been corrected is an unanswerable proof of Ward's assertion. It shows beyond the possibility of a doubt, that the Church of England, however scriptural it may pretend to have been in its origin, was in reality founded on a false version, which was a very *Babel* of confusion, which sometimes spoke the language of God and often the language of men, which had attempted to improve the lessons of eternal truth by the addition of the whims, the ignorance, the prejudices, and the falsehoods of Tyndal, Coverdale, Cranmer, etc., etc. Dr. Ward proves the corruptions of Protestant translations of the Bible by citing the following subjects:

1. Canonical Books of Scripture accepted by the Catholic Church. (See list in Apologetics, vol. 1, p. 33–35.) The Council of Trent (Sess. 4, Decret. de Can. Script.) decrees as follows: "If any man shall not receive for sacred and canonical these whole books, with all their parts, as they are read in the Catholic Church, and as they are in the Vulgate Latin edition, let him be accursed."

The Church of England rejects as Apocryphal the following:

"Tobias, Judith, part of the book of Esther, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Baruch with the Epistle of Jeremiah, The Song of the three children in Daniel, The Idol Bell and the Dragon, ibid, The Story of Susannah, ibid, Maccabees I, Maccabees II." That the rejection of these portions of the Bible is utterly unwarranted is abundantly shown by Dr. Ward in the conscientious analysis that he institutes of each one of them; and by quoting chapter and verse of the several passages that have been mistranslated, tampered with, or entirely corrupted, he proves the justice and correctness of the charges contained in the *Errata*.

2. Protestant Translations against the Church, p. 40, 41.*

3. Protestant Translations against the Blessed Sacrament and Sacrifice of the Mass, 42, 43.

4. Protestant Translations against the Blessed Sacrament and the Altar, 44, 45.

*The pages refer to Dr. Ward's work on the Errata of Protestant versions of the Scriptures.

5. Protestant Translations against Priests and Priesthood, 46, 47.

6. Protestant Translations against Priesthood and Holy Orders, 48, 49.

7. Protestant Translations against the Authority of Priests, 50, 51.

8. Protestant Translations against Episcopal Authority, 52, 53.

9. Protestant Translations against the Single Lives of Priests, 54, 55.

10. Protestant Translations against the Sacrament of Baptism, 56, 57.

11. Protestant Translations against Confession and the Sacrament of Penance, 58, 59.

12. Protestant Translations against the Honor of our Blessed Lady and other Saints, 60, 61.

13. Protestant Translations against the Distinction of Relative and Divine Worship, 62, 63.

14. Protestant Translations against the Sacred Images, 64, 65.

15. Protestant Translations against the Use of Sacred Images, 66, 69.

16. Protestant Translations against Limbus Patrum and Purgatory, 70–73.

17. Protestant Translations against Justification and the Reward of Good Works, 74, 75.

18. Protestant Translations against Merits and Meritorious Works, 76, 77.

19. Protestant Translations against Free Will, 78, 79.

20. Protestant Translations against Inherent Justice, 80, 81.

21. Protestant Translations in defence of the Sufficiency of Faith alone, 82, 83.

22. Protestant Translations against Apostolical Traditions, 84–86.

23. Protestant Translations against the Sacrament of Marriage, 84–86.

24. Protestant Corruptions by adding to Text, 88–90.

25. Protestant Translation against the Perpetual Sacrifice, 98–101.

26. A Vindication of the Roman Catholics, 112, 113.

27. A Vindication of Ward's Errata, in reply to Grier, by the Right Rev. Dr. Milner, 114–118.

To prove that the Protestant Translations of Holy Scripture are full of mistakes and errors designedly introduced is, after all, a comparatively easy task, for the disgraceful fact is freely admitted by the translators themselves, especially by the leaders of the so-called Reformation. This is clearly shown by Dr. Ward in the following statements, which contain a summary of the several points discussed in his "Errata:"

"How clear, limpid and pure the streams are that flow from the Greek and Hebrew fountains, through the channel of Protestant pens, the reader may easily guess, without taking the pains of comparing them, from the testimonies they themselves bear of one another's translations.

Zuinglius writes thus to Luther, concerning his corrupt translation: 'Thou corruptest the word of God, O Luther: thou art seen to be a manifest and common corrupter and perverter of the Holy Scripture; how much are we ashamed of thee, who have hitherto esteemed thee beyond all measure, and proved thee to be such a man!'[1]

Luther's Dutch translation of the Old Testament, especially of Job and the Prophets, had its blemishes, says Keckerman, and those no small ones,[2] neither are the blemishes in his New Testament to be accounted small ones, one of which is his omitting and wholly leaving out this text in St. John's Epistle: 'There be three who give testimony in heaven: the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, and these three are one.' Again in Rom. iii, 28, he adds the word 'alone' to the text, saying: 'We account a man to be justified by faith *alone*, without the works of the law.' Of which intolerable corruption being admonished, he persisted obstinate and wilful, saying: 'So I will, so I command; let

[1] Zuing. t. 2, ad Luth., lib. de S.

[2] Keckerman, Syst. 8; Theol., lib. 2, p. 188; 1 St. John, v. 7.

my will be instead of reason,' etc.[1] Luther will have it so; and at last thus concludes: 'The word *alone* must remain in my New Testament; although all the Papists run mad, they shall not take it from thence: it grieves me that I did not add also those two other words, *Omnibus et omnium, sine omnibus operibus omnium legum*, without all works of all laws.'

Again, in requital to Zuinglius, Luther rejects the Zuinglian translations, terming them in matter of divinity, 'fools, asses, antichrists, deceivers,'[2] etc.; and, indeed, not without cause; for what could be more deceitful and antichristian than, instead our Savior's words, 'this is my body,' to translate, 'this signifies my body,' as Zuinglius did, to maintain his figurative signification of the words, and cry down Christ's real presence in the Blessed Sacrament?

When Froscheverus, the Zuinglian printer of Zurich, sent Luther a Bible translated by the divines there, he would not receive it; but, as Hospinian and Lavatherus witness, sent it back and rejected it.[3]

The Tigurine translation was, in like manner, so distasteful to the other Protestants, 'that the Elector of Saxony in great anger rejected it and placed Luther's translation in room thereof.'[4]

Beza reproves the translation set forth by Œcolampadius, and the divines of Basle; affirming 'that the Basle translation is in many places wicked, and altogether differing from the mind of the Holy Ghost.'

Castalio's translation is also condemned by Beza,[5] as being sacrilegious, wicked and ethnical; insomuch, that Castalio wrote a special treatise in defence of it, in the preface of which he thus complains: 'Some reject our Latin and French translations of the Bible, not only as unlearned, but

[1] To. V. Germ. fol. 141, 144.

[2] See Zuing. Tom. 2, ad Luth. lib. de Sacr., fol. 388, 389.

[3] Hosp. Hist. Sacram. part. ult. fol. 183; Lavath. Hist. Sacram. i. 32.

[4] Hospin. in Concord. Discord. fol. 13.

[5] In Respons. ad Defens. et Respons. Castal. in Test. 1556, in Præfat. et in Annot. in Mat. iii. et iv., Luc. ii.; Act. viii. et x.; 1 Cor. i.

also as wicked, and differing in many places from the mind of the Holy Ghost.'

The learned Protestant Molinœus affirms of Calvin's translation 'that Calvin in his harmony makes the text of the Gospel to leap up and down; he uses violence to the letter of the Gospel; and besides this, adds to the text.'[1]

And touching Beza's translation, which our English especially follow, the same Molinœus charges him, that 'he actually changes the text;' giving likewise several instances of his corruptions. Castalio also, 'a learned Calvinist,' as Osiander says, 'and skilful in the tongues,' reprehends Beza in a book wholly written against his corruptions; and says further: 'I will not note all his errors, for that would require too large a volume.'[2]

In short, Bucer and the Osianderians rise up against Luther for his false translations; Luther against Munster; Beza against Castalio, and Castalio against Beza; Calvin against Servetus; Illyricus against both Calvin and Beza.[3] Staphylus and Emserus noted in Luther's Dutch Translations, of the New Testament only, about one thousand four hundred heretical corruptions.[4] And thus far of the confessed corruptions in foreign Protestant translators.

If you desire a character of our English Protestant versions, pray be pleased to take it from the words of these following Protestants; some of the most zealous and precise of whom, in a certain treatise, entitled, 'A petition directed to his most excellent majesty, King James the First,' complain 'that our translation of the songs comprised in our Book of Common Prayer, doth, in addition, subtraction, and alteration, differ from the truth of the Hebrew in at least two hundred places.' If two hundred corruptions were found in the Psalms only, and that by Protestants themselves, how many, think you, might be found from the beginning of Genesis to the end of the Apocalypse, if examined by an impartial and strict examination? And

[1] In Sua Translat. Nov. Test. Part 12, fol. 112.

[2] In Test. Part. 20, 30, 40, 64, 66, 74, 79, et Part. 8, 13, 14, 21, 23.

[3] In Defens. trans., p. 170.

[4] See Lind. Dub. p. 84, 85, 96, 98.

this they made the grounds of their scruple to make use of the Common Prayer; remaining doubtful, 'whether a man may with safe conscience, subscribe thereto;' yea, they wrote and published a particular treatise, entitled, 'A Defence of the Minister's Reasons for refusal of Subscribing;' the whole argument and scope thereof is only concerning mistranslating; yea, the reader may see, in the beginning of the said book, the title of every chapter, twenty-six in all, pointing to the mistranslations there handled in particular.[1]

Mr. Carlisle avouches, 'that the English translators have depraved the sense, obscured the truth, and deceived the ignorant: that in many places they distort the Scriptures from the right sense, and that they show themselves to love darkness more than light; falsehood more than truth.' Which Doctor Reynolds objecting against the Church of England, Mr. Whitaker had no better answer than to say: 'What Mr. Carlisle, with some others, has written against some places translated in our Bibles makes nothing to the purpose; I have not said otherwise, but that some things may be amended.'[2]

The ministers of Lincoln diocese could not forbear, in their great zeal, to signify to the king that the English translation of the Bible, 'is a translation that takes away from the text, that adds to the text, and that, sometimes, to the changing or obscuring of the meaning of the Holy Ghost,' calling it yet further, 'a translation which is absurd and senseless, perverting, in many places, the meaning of the Holy Ghost.'[3]

For which cause, Protestants of tender consciences made great scruple of subscribing thereto: 'How shall I,' says Mr. Burges, 'approve under my hand a translation which hath so many omissions, many additions, which sometimes obscures, sometimes perverts the sense; being sometimes senseless, sometimes contrary?'[4]

[1] Petition directed to His Majesty, p. 75, 76.
[2] Whitaker's Answer to Dr. Reynolds, p. 255.
[3] See the abridgement, which the Ministers of Lincoln Diocese delivered to his Majesty, p. 11, 12, 13.
[4] Burgess, apol. Sect. 6, and in Covel's answer to Burges, p. 93.

This great evil of corrupting the Scriptures being well considered by Mr. Broughton, one of the most zealous sort of Protestants, obliged him to write an epistle to the Lords of the Council, desiring them with all speed to procure a new translation: 'Because,' says he, 'that which is now in England is full of errors.'[1] And in his advertisements of corruptions, he tells the Bishops, 'that their public translation of Scriptures into English is such, that it perverts the text of the Old Testament in eight hundred and forty-eight places, and that it causes millions of millions to reject the New Testament, and run to eternal flames,' a most dreadful saying, certainly, for all those who are forced to receive such a translation for their only rule of faith. (See "Conquests of our Holy Faith," by James J. Treacy, p. 437.)

NOTE E (p. 508, Vol. II.)

Papal Infallibility.

Canons Liddon and Bright of the Anglican Church, in their church defense Tract No. 3, attempt to disprove the privilege of infallibility of the Roman Pontiffs. Their efforts are mainly directed to the case of Pope Honorius whom they accuse of holding and teaching the heresy of Monothelism, according to which there is admitted in Christ only one Will, the divine, the human having been entirely absorbed and annulled in the Incarnation.

As to similar charges made against Pope Liberius (A. D. 352) and Pope Vigilius (A. D. 538) the Tract writers themselves admit that they cannot be fairly urged as disproving infallibility. For Liberius, according to them, issued no definition *en cathedra* in the sense of the Vatican Council; and the case of Pope Vigilius, is not, properly speaking, relevant to the present question, as he also was not defining a doctrine in the sense of the Vatican decree. As to Pope Liberius, who has been accused of subscribing an Arian formula of Faith, and of condemning St. Athanasius, it is now held by competent critics that that

[1] See the Triple Cord, p. 147.

Pontiff's fall is entirely fictitious. Hence Bossuet, referring to this matter, speaks as follows: "I have expunged from my treatise on the Ecclesiastical Power all that regards Pope Liberius, as it could not prove the point that I intended to establish."

There remains then the solitary case of Pope Honorius I. (A. D. 625), who is said to have espoused the cause of the Monothelites, and to have been, on that account, condemned both by the Sixth Ecumenical Council, held in Constantinople in the years 680-681, under Pope Agatho, and by Leo II. (A. D. 682). Our answer, based on unimpeachable authorities, to be quoted hereafter, implies an emphatic denial of the charge taken from documents subject to the gravest suspicions of fraudulent interpolations. The Fathers of the Council and St. Leo did not condemn Honorius for having promulgated an erroneous definition of Faith addressed to the Universal Church, nor for having himself professed Monothelism, but simply blamed him for not having used more vigorous means for its suppression, and because, by imposing silence on the disputants, instead of checking the spread of heresy, he rather fomented it. Hence the most our opponents can show in this lamentable case, is that Pontiff s negligence in making use of his apostolic power, under the critical circumstances, in which he found himself. But this does not affect our thesis regarding the infallibility of the Head of the Church, when teaching or defining a matter of Faith as held by the Church and explicitly proposed as such to all the Faithful. That Honorius did nothing to impugn this, is manifest from the very charge which is made against him, the silencing of discussion, and the refusal to define. Therefore, the Conciliary and Pontifical censures of Honorius, whatever they may have been, come to this—that they condemned him precisely for not putting an end to the discussion by the exercise of his gift of infallibility; for negligence in the performance of his Pontifical office; for too great credulity in believing the protestations and explanations of Sergius, the crafty Monothelite Patriarch of Constantinople, and for his imprudent

silence, whereby he permitted the Faith to be endangered through the machinations of that wily heretic.

As Father Lyons pertinently remarks, in his book cited below, p. 226, it must be admitted that if, in the whole history of the Papacy, from the day of Pentecost to the present moment, *one solitary case* could be cited where *an ex-cathedra* act (or decision) of one Pope contradicted an *ex-cathedra* act (or decision) of another, or of a General Council (or an evident Scriptural truth), such a fact would be absolutely fatal to the dogma of infallibility. (See p. 499, Vol. II.) But such a case does not exist and cannot be produced. The enemies of Infallibility have searched history through and through; lynx-eyed they have scrutinized the acts of Popes and Councils for eighteen hundred years, but without success. Can we, independently of the special assistance of the Holy Spirit, and of the privilege of infallibility divinely conferred on the Roman Pontiffs, can we, I say, account for the wonderful harmony in the *ex-cathedra* teaching of the Popes from St. Peter to Leo XIII.? How then does the case stand? Out of two hundred and fifty-eight Pontiffs, in the course of nineteen centuries, only a few have been impeached: and, it has been shown that the case against every one of those few, upon close and impartial examination, breaks down completely to the great discomfiture of the enemies of the Papacy.

References:—1. Weninger, F. X., S. J.—Apostolical and Infallible Authority of the Popes, p. 334.

2. Bottalla, P., S. J.—Pope Honorius before the Tribunal of Reason and History.

3. Lyons, D.—Christianity or Infallibility, Both or Neither, p. 226.

4. Humphrey, W., S. J.—The Divine Teacher, p. xii.

5. Mazzella, Cardinal, S. J.—De Ecclesia, Prop. xxxix.

6. Ryder—Catholic Controversy, pp. 27, 28, 68.

7. Catholic Dictionary—Pope Honorius I., p. 408; Pope Liberius, p. 515.

8. Ecclesiastical Dictionary, p. 420.

9. Alzog—Manual of Universal Church History, vol. I, p. 538, 624, 633.

10. Darras—General History of the Catholic Church, vol. I, p. 446; vol. II, p. 147 and 214.

11. Kenrick—The Primacy of the Apostolic See, p. 177.

12. Brownson—Vol. XIII, p. 364–424.

13. Palmieri, D., S. J.—Tractatus de Romano Pontifice, Thesis xxxiii.

This distinguished theologian in that thesis directed against the opponents of Papal Infallibility triumphantly refutes all the charges made against that privilege by a thorough discussion of the following historical cases:

St. Hormisdas, A. D., 514, and John II, A. D., 532. Nicholas III, A D., 1277, and John XXII, A. D., 1316. Liberius, A. D., 352; Nicholas I, A. D., 858; Stephen VII, A. D., 897; Honorius I, A. D., 625. Zachary, A. D., 741; Sixtus V, A. D., 1585; Innocent III, 1198, and the case of Galileo, (See our Christian Apologetics, Vol. II, p. 608-624.)

NOTE F. (Vol. 2, p. 650.)

Historical Summary of the Arbitrations and Mediations Exercised by the Roman Pontiffs with Princely Rulers.

A. D.

452, St. Leo I. surnamed the Great—Attila, the King of the Huns.

592, St. Gregory I., called the Great—Agilulfus, King of the Longobards on behalf of the Romans.

595, The same holy Pontiff—The Empire and the Longobards.

741, St. Zachary—King Luitprand.

656, Stephen II.—King Desiderio.

1052, St. Leo IX.—Emperor Henry, and Andrew, King of Hungary.

1056, Victor II.—Baldwin and Godfreid, Empress Agnes and her son.

1199, Innocent III.—Andrew and Henry, sons of King Bola of Hungary.

1224, Honorius III.—Louis, King of France and Henry, King of England.

1245, Innocent IV.—King of Portugal and his subjects.

1279, Nicholas III.—several mediations in Italy.

1317, John XXII.—Edward II, King of England and Robert Bruce, King of Scotland.

1340, Benedict XII.—Edward III, Plantagenet and Philip of Valois, King of France.

1370, Gregory XI.—King of Portugal and King of Castile.

1447, Nicholas V.—Mediations in Germany, Hungary and Italy.

1485, Innocent VII.—Mediations in Moravia, Austria and England.

1493, Alexander VI.—Portugal and Spain. Bull of Partition. (See Fredet's "Modern History," p. 520.)

1628, Urban VII.—calming dissensions caused by rival claimants to the Duchies of Mantua and Monferrato.

1582, Gregory XIII.—King of Poland and Czar of Moscovia.

1885, Leo XIII.—Germany and Spain, on the question of ownership of the Caroline Islands. The Protocol or State Paper issued on the occasion by Leo XIII., discussing the vexed question and awarding the decision to Spain, was looked upon by leading statesmen of Europe and America as a masterpiece of international jurisprudence, truly worthy of the Chief Pastor of God's Church.

N. B. As Edward Soderini, the compiler of this list remarks, in all the mediations the Popes constantly aimed at the establishment of peace.—(Taken from the Italian Daily, *Unita' Cattolica*, for Oct. 24, 1885.

List of the Roman Pontiffs.

As in the Registers of the Roman Church.

ST. PETER, PRINCE OF THE APOSTLES, *41–67.

St. Peter received the Supreme Pontificate from Christ (Matth. xvi, John xxi). He resided for a time at Antioch, and afterwards established his See at Rome, where he died a Martyr, under Nero, June 29, A. D. 67.

	A. D.		A.D.
Linus.	67	Mark.	336
Cletus or Anacletus	79	Julius I.	337
Clement I.	91	Liberius.	352
Evaristus.	100	Felix II.†	355
Alexander I.	109	Damasus I.	366
Sixtus I.	119	Siricius	384
Telesphorus.	128	Anastasius I.	398
Hyginus.	138	Innocent I.	402
Pius I.	142	Zosimus.	417
Anicetus.	157	Boniface I.	418
Soter.	168	Cœlestine I.	422
Eleutherius.	177	Sixtus III.	432
Victor I.	190	Leo I. (the Great)	440
Zephyrinus.	202	Hilary.	461
Callistus I.	218	Simplicius.	468
Urban I.	222	Felix III.	483
Pontian.	230	Gelasius I.	492
Anterus.	235	Anastasius II.	496
Fabian.	236	Symmachus.	498
Cornelius.	251	Hormisdas.	514
Lucius I.	253	John I.	523
Stephen I.	254	Felix IV.	526
Sixtus II.	257	Boniface II.	530
Dionysius.	259	John II.	532
Felix I.	269	Agapitus.	535
Eutychian.	275	Silverius.	536
Caius.	283	Vigilius.	537
Marcellinus.	296	Pelagius I.	555
Marcellus I.	307	John III.	560
Eusebius.	309	Benedict I.	574
Melchiades.	310	Pelagius II.	578
Silvester I.	314	Gregory I. (the Great)	590

*Year of Accession to Roman See.

†Pope during Exile of Liberius, though he is generally held to have been an intruder, an Antipope.

Sabinian.	A.D. 604
Boniface III.	607
Boniface IV.	608
Deusdedit I.	615
Boniface V.	619
Honorius I.	625
Severinus.	640
John IV.	640
Theodore I.	642
Martin I.	649
Eugene I.	655
Vitalian.	657
Deusdedit II.	672
Donus I.	676
Agatho.	678
Leo II.	682
Benedict II.	684
John V.	685
Conon.	686
Sergius I.	687
John VI.	701
John VII.	705
Sisinnius.	708
Constantine I.	708
Gregory II.	715
Gregory III.	731
Zachary.	741
Stephen III.*	752
Paul I.	757
Constantine II.	767
Stephen IV.	768
Hadrian I.	771
Leo III.	795
Stephen V.	816
Paschal I.	817
Eugene II.	824
Valentine.	827
Gregory IV.	827
Sergius II.	844
Leo IV.	847
Benedict III.	855
Nicholas I. (the Great)	858
Hadrian II.	867
John VIII.	872
Marinus I.	882
Hadrian III.	884
Stephen VI.	885
Formosus.	891
Boniface VI.	896
Stephen VII.	896
Romanus.	897
Theodore II.	897
John IX.	898
Benedict IV.	900
Leo V.	903
Christopher	903
Sergius III.	904
Anastasius III.	911
Lando.	913
John X.	914
Leo VI.	928
Stephen VIII.	929
John XI.	931
Leo VII.	936
Stephen IX.	939
Marinus II.†	943
Agapitus II.	946
John XII.	955
Leo VIII.	963
Benedict V.	964
John XIII.	965
Benedict VI.	973
Benedict VII.	974
John XIV.	983
John XV.	985
Gregory V.	996
Silvester II.	999
John XVII.‡	1003
John XVIII.	1003
Sergius IV.	1009
Benedict VIII.	1012
John XIX.	1024

*Stephen II. (752) died before consecration.

†Marinus I., II. were also called (Martinus) Martin II., III,

‡This Pontiff took the name of John XVII. to prevent his acts being confounded with those of the antipope John XVI. (997), in the time of Gregory V. Similar changes were made by other legitimate Popes for the same reason.

Benedict IX.	A.D. 1033	Nicholas IV.	A.D. 1288
Gregory VI.	1045	Celestine V.	1294
Clement II.	1046	Boniface VIII.*	1294
Damasus II.	1048	Benedict XI.	1303
Leo IX.	1049	Clement V.	1305
Victor II.	1055	John XXII.	1316
Stephen X.	1057	Benedict XII.	1334
Nicholas II.§	1059	Clement VI.	1342
Alexander II.	1061	Innocent VI.	1352
Gregory VII.	1073	Urban V.	1362
Victor III.	1086	Gregory XI.	1370
Urban II.	1088	Urban VI.†	1378
Paschal II.	1099	Boniface IX.	1389
Gelasius II.	1118	Innocent VII.	1404
Callistus II.	1119	Gregory XII.	1406
Honorius II.	1124	Alexander V.	1409
Innocent II.	1130	John XXIII.	1410
Celestine II.	1143	Martin V.	1417
Lucius II.	1144	Eugene IV.	1431
Eugene III.	1145	Nicholas V.	1447
Anastasius IV.	1153	Callistus III.	1455
Hadrian IV.	1154	Pius II.	1458
Alexander III.	1159	Paul II.	1464
Lucius III.	1181	Sixtus IV.	1471
Urban III.	1185	Innocent VIII.	1484
Gregory VIII.	1187	Alexander VI.	1492
Clement III.	1187	Pius III.	1503
Celestine III.	1191	Julius II.	1503
Innocent III.	1198	Leo X.	1513
Honorius III.	1216	Adrian VI.	1522
Gregory IX.	1227	Clement VII.	1523
Celestine IV.	1241	Paul III.	1534
Innocent IV.	1243	Julius III.	1550
Alexander IV.	1254	Marcellus II.	1555
Urban IV.	1261	Paul IV.	1555
Clement IV.	1265	Pius IV.	1559
Gregory X.	1271	Pius V.	1566
Innocent V.	1276	Gregory XIII.	1572
Hadrian V.	1276	Sixtus V.	1585
John XX. or (XXI.)	1276	Urban VII.	1590
Nicholas III.	1277	Gregory XIV.	1590
Martin IV.	1281	Innocent IX.	1591
Honorius IV.	1285	Clement VIII.	1592

§Benedict X (1058) Antipope. *Boniface VII. (974) Antipope.

†Clement VII., 1378, Avignon, Antipope. Benedict XIII., 1394, Avignon, Antipope.

Leo XI.	A.D. 1605	Innocent XIII.	A.D. 1721
Paul V.	1605	Benedict XIII.	1724
Gregory XV.	1621	Clement XII.	1730
Urban VIII.	1623	Benedict XIV.	1740
Innocent X.	1644	Clement XIII.	1758
Alexander VII.	1655	Clement XIV.	1769
Clement IX.	1667	Pius VI.	1775
Clement X.	1670	Pius VII.	1800
Innocent XI.	1676	Leo XII.	1823
Alexander VIII.	1689	Pius VIII.	1829
Innocent XII.	1691	Gregory XVI.	1831
Clement XI.	1700	Pius IX.	1846

LEO XIII. 1878.

N. B.—The present list has been transcribed from "The Papal Monarchy," by Wm. Barry, D.D.

General

Alphabetical and Analytical Index

TO THE TWO VOLUMES.

The numbers do not indicate the page, but the paragraphs in the body of the work, from number 1 to 297 of 1st Volume, and 298 to 561 of 2nd Volume.

ACTS, of the senses 101; of the intellect 103, 104; of the will 74 (see *free-act, liberty, will*); of Faith 148.

ACTS OF THE APOSTLES 151.

AGNOSTICISM 39. (See Index to Notes.)

APOSTLES, as connected with the Resurrection 222–227; their miracles 238; entrusted with the government and ministry of the Church 317, 318, 324, 325, 326.

ARK OF NOAH 164.

ASTRONOMY not opposed to the Bible 165, 166. (See *Galileo.*)

ATHEISTS vainly state that the belief in God's existence is not universal 11, 13, 15; or that it is due to prejudices of education 19, fear 20, and legislators 21; and fail to disprove it by the infinite series 27, and by some common and false beliefs 13, 22; and by stating it as only an article of faith 23. Consequences 38. (See *Materialists.*)

AUTHENTICITY of a book 152; of the Pentateuch 153; of the Gospels 189-191.

BABILON stands for Rome 365.

BALUFFI on the civilizing influence of the Church of Rome 554.

BAPTISM, threefold 441.

BARBARIANS affirming God's existence 10; how changed by the Church 531.

BARTHOLOMEW'S (St.) massacre 476.

BERGIER on miracles 205.

BIBLE and Geology 159, 163; Astronomy 165, 167; Biology 168, 169; Paleontology 170, 184; modern discoveries in Egypt 185, 186, Chaldea and Assyria 187, 188. (See *Sacred Scripture, Pentateuch.*)

BIOLOGY and the Bible 168, 169.

BOLLANDISTS 230, 331.

BOOK; its authority 152; books of the Scripture 150.

BROGLIE DE, on the history of the Gospels 194.

BROWNSON on the vicious circle 443; on bad Popes 504; on national greatness, 539; on the influence of the Roman Church on learning 559.

BUDDHISM compared with Christianity 278, 279; its history 287, dogmas 281, morals 282. Practical and Popular Buddhism 284.

CALENDAR, its reformation 544 (note).

CATHOLIC. One may be a good Catholic and a good citizen 422. For *Catholic Church* see *Roman Church.*

CATHOLICITY OF THE CHURCH 322, 323; found in the Roman Church 332, not in the Protestant 345, nor in the Greek Schismatic Church 357.

CERTITUDE, its criterion in the attainment of Faith 147, 208.

CHRISTIANS, their charity 243; some famous ones 297, 556, 557.

CHRISTIANITY, its Divinity proved by the miracles of Jesus 215, and His resurrection 218; by the fulfillment of prophecies 228, 238, 240, 241; by the miracles of the Apostles 238, 239; by its establishment and propagation 244, and preservation 254; by its martyrs 256; by the changes wrought in the world 261; by the teachings of Christ, doctrinal 265, and moral 269, and by His holiness 287; ever the same 255; compared with other religions 273, 275, especially with Buddhism 278, and Eddyism 286; obligatory on all 297; where is it? 298. (See *Church* and *Roman Church.*)

CHRONOLOGY OF THE BIBLE, uncertain 181; lacking in Egypt, India and China 184.

CHURCH, its nature 300; it is a society 301; founded by Christ 302, 304; obligatory on all 297, 305; its end 306, and constitution 307; a perfect society 308; it has distinguishing marks 309, 312, i. e., unity 313, of doctrine or belief 314, 316, and of government 317; sanctity 319, 321; Catholicity 322, 323, and Apostolicity 324, 327; all found in the Roman Church 328, 334; not in the Protestant 335, 351; nor in the Schismatic 353, 358. (See *Roman Church, Protestantism* and *Greek Schismatic Church.*) Its indefectibility 367, 370, and authority 371, with the power of teaching 372, 376, of dispensing the Sacraments 377, and of governing 378; its infallibility 379, 382, in matters of faith and morals 383; object of it 384, and subject 385, which is the body of Bishops united with their Head and the Roman Pontiff speaking as its chief Pastor 386, 389; Church and State 390; its independence as a spiritual power 391, 394, from the civil power 395; its rights 396, must prevail 397, 400; it must help the State 401, and be helped by it 402, 406; its relation to liberalism 407, 411, and modern liberties 412, 418; its tolerance 419, 428; Roman Church 328, 334, 429. (See *Roman Church.*)

CIVILIZATION before Christ 509, 520, and after 521, 560. (See *Roman Church.*)

COGNITION, sensitive 101; ideal 103.

CONSCIENCE, as a proof of free will 66, 83.

COPERNICUS, system of, noticed 472.

COUNCILS, general 385; mention of some 366; Vatican Council (see term).
CRUSADES 480; their lawfulness 481, and results 482.
DARWINISM and living beings 26; inert matter 28, 30; its tenets 33, 35, 36, on spontaneous generation 168, 169, and on man 171, 179.
DAYS OF CREATION 159, 160.
DELUGE, the mosaic 162; its extent 163.
DEMONSTRATION, threefold 214.
DETERMINISTS, the opponents of free will 64; answers to their objections 83, 93.
DISCOVERIES of geologists 182, 183, and of others in Egypt 184, 186, and Assyria 214.
EDDYISM 286.
EDUCATION without God 17.
END OF ALL, God 51, 53; end or purpose of the Church.
ENERGY, its conservation and connection with free will 93.
ERRATA of the Protestant translations of the Bible 337. (See Index to Notes.)
EVANGELISTS 151, 189 (see *Gospels*).
EVIL, physical or moral, not against the goodness of God 45. (See *Liberty, Hell.*)
EVOLUTION. (See *Darwinism.*)
EVOLUTIONISTS refuted 32, 36, 168, 169, 171, 179.
EXPERIENCE, its nature 147.
FAITH, supernatural, how attained 147; its nature 148; how joined with free will 148; Faith cure 286; Faith, as the Protestant rule 347; article of, as distinguished from reason 23.
FAMILY, its state before Christ 517, and after 528.
FREPPEL on religion and science 157 (3d rem. note); on the services rendered by the Papacy 544.
FREE ACT, preceded by an act of knowledge, a first movement of the will, judgment on the proposed good, deliberation and *free* decision 78, 83.
GALILEO, his process 469, 470, not against the infallibility of the Church or the Pope 471, what and how he taught 472, 473.
GALLICANISM 386 (note).
GENERATION, no spontaneous 26, 30, 168, 169, 183, concl.
GEOLOGISTS 30, and the origin of the world 159, and its age 161; on the extent of the deluge 163; on the reappearance of vegetation 167; on fossils 170, and the antiquity of man 182, 183.
GLADIATORS before Christ 514, and after 523.
GOD, notion of 1, 2; His existence 3, 4, proved by the moral law 5, 7; affirmed by mankind 8, 15, in an evident manner 16; objections 18, 23; proved by the order of the world 24, 32, the work of an intelligence 33, 36, divine 37; God's nature and attributes 40; He is the necessary being 41, infinite 42, a pure spirit 43, infinite

intelligence 44, infinite goodness 45, one 46, immense 47, immutable 48, 205, eternal 49, all powerful 50, chief and last end of all 51, and of man 52, 129; Jesus is God 215 et seqq.

GOSPELS numbered 151; their authenticity 189, 191, integrity 192, veracity 193, 194; objections 195, 198.

GREEK SCHISMATIC CHURCH 353; its history 354; it has no unity 355, no sanctity 356, no catholicity 357, no apostolicity 358.

HAPPINESS, as man's tendency 116; as enjoyed by the unbaptized 441 (with note).

HELL, its existence and nature. Incurred by the wicked. Its eternity proved from Scripture, the consent of mankind, and reason, confirmed by remarks 124, and answers to objections 125.

HERETICS, material and formal, do they belong to the Church? 441, 442.

HISTORY regarding the existence of God 9, 11; on the antiquity of man 184, of the discoveries in Egypt, Chaldea and Assyria 186, of the resurrection of Jesus 219; of the destruction of Jerusalem 240; of Buddhism 280; of the Schism of the West 330; of the Greek 354, and Protestant Church 336; of the Inquisition 450; of Galileo 470; of Josue 472, 5; of the massacre of St. Bartholomew 476; of the Crusades 481; of the wars of religion 483, and of the edict of Nantes 486.

HUMAN SPECIES. (See *Species*.) Human soul. (See *Soul*.)

HYPNOTISM 210, 5.

HYPOTHESIS 420 (note).

IDEAS, their nature 103.

IMMORTALITY of the soul, its nature 111, and opponents 112. Its proofs from the consent of mankind 113; from its spirituality 114, 115; and tendency towards perfect happiness 116, 119; and from the moral law 120, 122; answers to objections 123.

INDEFECTIBILITY of the Church, its nature, 367; and proofs 368,370.

INFALLIBILITY of the Church, its nature 379, and proofs 380, 382, 443; in matters of faith and morals 383. Its object 384, and subject 385, which is the body of the Bishops united with their head and the Roman Pontiff 386, 388. Its conditions 389. Not weakened in Galileo's case 471, or by conduct of some Popes 472; by any of their dogmatic decisions 389.

INQUISITION 449; ecclesiastical 450, and Spanish 451. Its lawfulness on the part of the Church 453, and of the State 454. What should one think of it 457, 467.

INSPIRATION of the Bible 351; its nature 352.

INTEGRITY of a book, what it is 152; of the Pentateuch 154; of the Gospels 192.

INTELLIGENCE, the cause of order 33; infinite in God 44. As an act of man 103; light of 147.

NTOLERANCE, Catholic 430, Protestant 431, 437; of others 438, 439.

ISLAMISM, how propagated 253.
JERUSALEM, its ruin foretold and accomplished 240.
JESUS, His miracles 215, 217, and resurrection 218, 226; objections 227; prophecies 228, 234, and figures concerning Him 235; fulfillment of the prophecies 236, 237; His teachings 265, on God 266, on man 267, on the world 268, on morality 269, 270, on worship 271; Remarks on these teachings 272; His Holiness, 287, 288, mission 289, and Divinity 290, 294; founded a Church 302, 304; obligatory on all 305, 308; endowed with marks 314, 326; confided to Peter 360, 363, and to his successors 364. (See *Church, Pope.*)
JONAH'S MIRACLE 157 (note).
JUDGMENT, as an act of the mind 104.
KEPLER on the miracle at Gabaon 157.
KNIGHTS TEMPLARS 460.
LABORERS, their state before Christ 516, and after 527.
LACORDAIRE on prophecies 237, on the concept of God 2 (note).
LAW of chemical combinations 28. Moral (see *Moral Law.*) Physical as regards miracles 202, 205, 207 (note), 208.
LEO XIII. on science 157, on Anglican orders 346 (note), on the relations between Church and State 390, on liberalism 407, 408, on tolerance 419.
LIBERAL PARTY, what it is 411.
LIBERALISM, ancient and modern 407; divided into radical, governmental 408, 409, and Catholic 410.
LIBERTY OF MAN, not at variance with God's foreknowledge 44; its general notion 56; immunity from constraint 57, and from interior necessity 59; remarks on this definition 60, 63; determinists its opponents 64; human freedom proved from the testimony of conscience 65, 73; from the analysis of the free act 74, 83; answers to objections 84, 93; modern liberties 412, and what to think of them 414, 418.
LIFE, its nature 57 (note;) it cannot spring from matter 30.
LLORENTE, his doings and writings on the Inquisition 461 (note), 464.
MAGNETISM, animal 210.
MAITLAND, on the vandalism of Protestants 559.
MAN, his last end 52, 129; his soul 55; tends toward perfect happiness 116; his origin according to the Bible and transformism 171; his essential difference from lower animals 172, and in particular from the ape 173, 179; his antiquity according to the Bible 181, geology, 182, and history 184; he must embrace Christ's Church 297, 305.
MANKIND affirms the existence of God 8, 23, the immortality of the soul 113, and the eternity of hell 124, 2d proof.
MANNING on the evolution of man 173.
MARKS OF THE CHURCH. (See *Church.*)

MARTYRS, their testimony 256; number 259.

MATERIALISTS, their tenets 26, 96, 112, 168; their objections against the spirituality 108, 109; and the immortality of the soul 123.

MATTER, innert, not the sufficient cause of contingent beings, 28, 29, nor of life 30.

METAPHYSICS, its definition and division 286.

MIDDLE AGES and the Popes 489, 496, 544. (See *Pope.*)

MIRACLE, its nature 202, and possibility 203, 204; not opposed to any attribute of God 205; its occurrence ascertainable 206, in some cases 207, and in cases of false miracles 209, 210. Its value as a proof 211, 239 (rem.); some miracles, i. e., that of Gabaon 157, of Jonah (ib. note), of Jesus 215, 216, of the resurrection 218, of the followers of Christ 239. Miracles of the moral order, i. e., the propagation of Christianity 244, 253, and its preservation through ages 254; Calvin's false miracle 346.

MONISM 107 (note).

MORAL LAW, affirmed by mankind, 5, is a reality 6, with God for its author 7, and with a sanction 7, 124; it proves the soul's immortality 120, 122; its divisions 124; moral teachings of Christ 269, and of Buddhism 282.

MORALITY cannot be without liberty 69, 70, 88. (See *Moral Law.*

MOSES, the author of the Pentateuch 150, 153; is veracious 155; on the origin of the world 160; on the deluge 162; on the ark 164.

MYSTERIES OF RELIGION 144; not against reason 145; mystery of the Trinity 146; of the Incarnation 166, and note B.

NANTES EDICT revoked 484; legitimately 485; was it opportune? 486; what should one think of its results 487.

NATIONS, Catholic and Protestant compared 536.

NATURAL RELIGION 40, 127; supernatural or positive 128; natural selection. (See *Darwinism.*)

NATURE, of God 40; of other things 33. As the aggregate of the beings of the Universe, not their cause, but rather a fictitious term 33, 2 (note).

ORDER, moral 5. (See *Liberty, Evil*). Order of the world 24; exists 32, and argues an intelligence 33, which is divine 37.

PALEONTOLOGY, what is it? 170; its vain attempts against the true origin of man 171 et seqq., and his antiquity 182, 183.

PANTHEISM, what is it? 33, 2, c, 43 (note).

PATRIARCHS, length of their lives 155 (note).

PENTATEUCH 150; its authenticity 153; integrity 154, and veracity 155; though not a scientific book 157; it is not at variance with geology with its six days 159, 161, and the deluge 162, 164; nor with Astronomy 165, 167; nor with Biology 168, 169; nor with Paleontology 170 et seqq.

PERFECTIONS, their division 42.

PERSECUTIONS, prophecied by Christ 242; His prophecies accomplished 250, 260.

PETER, ST., promised the primacy 360; made Head of the Church 361; so understood the ancient Fathers 365, and Tradition 363. He was Bishop of Rome and died there 365, 366. (See *Primacy.*)

POLYTHEISM 46.

POOR, their state before Christ 515, and after 526.

POPE, or the Bishop of Rome, the successor of St. Peter, 365, 366; his infallibility 386, 389. Popes, their authority over Christian princes 489, was legitimate 497; there may be bad Popes 502, and there were some 503. How they exercised the office of arbitrators and mediators 495, 496. (See *Roman Church.*)

POUCHARD on the antiquity of man 183.

PRAYER as connected with Providence and miracles 203, 205.

PRIMACY, its nature 359; conferred by Christ on Peter 360, 363, and on his successors 364; possessed by the Church of Rome 365, 366.

PRINCIPLE of sufficient reason and causality 26.

PROPHECY, its nature 212, possibility 213; value as a proof 214; some prophecies concerning Christ 228, 235, and their fulfillment 236, 237; some made by Christ Himself and their fulfillment 240, 243.

PROTESTANTISM 335. Its history 336, 339, 341, 345, 346, 351, 431; it has no Unity 337, nor Holiness 341, 344, nor Catholicity 345, nor Apostolicity 346; its rule of faith 347, 348, 351; intolerance 431, 437, 466, and vandalism 559.

PROVIDENCE in connection with prayer and miracles 203, 205.

RACES, their difference 179; human race ib.

REASON, as an act of the intellect 104; its function in matters of faith 141 et seq. It elaborates the data furnished by the senses 147; light of reason 147.

RELIGION, its nature 126; natural 127, and supernatural 128; its mysteries 144, not against reason 145, 147; religions compared 273 et seqq. Wars of religion 483 et seqq. For Roman Religion, Protestant religion, etc., see *Roman Church, Protestantism*, etc.

REVELATION, its nature 130, possibility 131, and necessity 132, 134; primitive 137, mosaic 138, and Christian 139; transmitted by testimony 147

RESURRECTION of some 215, of Jesus 218, 227.

ROMAN CHURCH, on the function of reason in matters of Faith 141; she has Unity 328, 329, Holiness 331, Catholicity 332, and Apostolicity 333, 334; not averse to the reading of the Bible 351; she has the primacy 365; vainly attacked as to the schism of the west 330; for her intolerance 430; for the maxim, out of the Church no salvation 440; for the Inquisition 453; for the suppression of the Knights Templars 460; for the process of Galileo 471; for St. Bartholomew's massacre 477; for the Crusades 481; for the wars of religion 483; for the revocation of the edict of Nantes 487, B; for the the power exercised over secular princes 490; for the tem-

poral power 497; and on account of some bad Popes 502; her civilizing influence 508, 521, on slaves, 523, the poor 526, laborers 527, on the family 528, civil society 530, barbarians 531; compared with Protestant nations 535; her influence on learning 473, 541, 544; fine arts 545, education 547, 554, and science 556, 559; she will last to the end 368, 561. (See *Church, Pope, Religion.*)

Russian Schismatic Church 355, B. (See *Schismatic Churches.*)

Sacred Scripture. Number of the books 149. (See *Bible, Gospels, Pentateuch.*)

Sanction of a law 7, 124; punitive and remunerative 124. (See *Hell.*)

Sanctity of the Church 319, a mark of truth 321, belongs to the Roman Church 331, 502, not the Protestant 341, nor to the Schismatic Greek or Oriental Church 356. (See *Roman Church*)

Schismatic Churches, their history 353, 354, 355.

Schism of the West 330, 334.

Schouppe on spontaneous generation 168; on the Popes and the Middle Ages 491.

Science and the Pentateuch 150, 359. (See *Bible, Pentateuch.*)

Science (Christian) or Eddyism refuted 286.

Scientists affirming God 14; denying God 15; some distinguished Catholic 556, 557.

Sects, the enumeration of some 337.

Sensitive cognition, its nature and division 101.

Series infinite, impossible 27.

Sin, original 267; in general 44, 46.

Slavery before Christ 511, and after 523.

Society, its nature 301; when perfect 308; benefited by the Popes 495; its state before Christ 518, and after 530.

Soul of Man, 55; its liberty stated 56, 63, and proved 65, 83; its spirituality 98, and immortality 99; its union with the body 107.

Southall, on the antiquity of man 184.

Spanish Inquisition 451; its lawfulness in general 454, 455; what should we think of its proceedings 463.

Species defined 178; human species, its unity of origin 176, and its antiquity 180.

State; as related to the Church 390; it must not oppose her 391, but must be helped by her 401, and help her 402. (See *Society.*)

St. Barthomew's Massacre 476; a political affair 477.

Supernatural Religion 128, 136. (See *Church, Roman Church.*)

Temporal Power of the Popes, legitimate 497, 500.

Testimony 147; in miracles 207; in the resurrection 222; of the martyrs 256; of conscience as to free will 66; of mankind (see *Mankind.*)

Theology, on the function of reason in matters of Faith 142.

Theosophy, an absurd and fraudulent creed 285. (See Index to Notes.)

THESIS, what 420 (note.)
TOLERANCE OF THE CHURCH, lawful 419, 423.
TRADITION 352; as a proof of the Unity of the Church 315, and her Apostolicity 325, and the primacy of Peter 363.
TRANSFORMISM 171, 175.
UNITY OF THE CHURCH, its nature 313, i. e., unity of doctrine and belief 314, 316, and unity of government or of minstry 317, 318; both found in the Church of Rome 328, 329, notwithstanding the schism of the West 330, not in the Protestant 337, 340, nor in the Greek Church 355.
VATICAN COUNCIL, on the necessity of revelation 134, on Faith 148, on the infallibility of the Pope 386, on scientific studies 542.
VAUGHAN, on the origin of life 30; on the prosperity of Protestant nations 539.
VERACITY OF A BOOK 152; of the Pentateuch 155; of the Gospels 193, 194; answers to objections 196, 199.
WARS OF RELIGION 483.
WILL OF MAN, it is free as proved from the testimony of conscience 66, and the analysis of the free act 74, 83; answer to objections 84; how joined with Faith 148.
WORLD, the visible, proves the existence of God 24, by its imperfections and perfections 26, 32; its end 51, and origin, God 160; Jesus, doctrine on 260; its state before Christ 262, 509, and after 263, 264, 521.
WORSHIP, as taught by Christ 271; changed by Protestants 338; Liberty of 421.

Index to Notes.

A. Agnosticism, p. 743, Vol. II.
B. A Specious Objection, p. 746, Vol. II.
C. Theosophy, p. 749, Vol. II.
D. Errata of the Protestant Bible, p. 753, Vol. II.
E. Papal Infallibility, p. 762 ,Vol. II.
F. The Popes as Arbitrators, p. 765, Vol. II.

Index of Writers

Quoted or referred to in this Work, as bearing on the Subjects treated therein.

N. B.—The figures refer to the page of either volume as marked.

Addis, vol. 1, [206].
Agassiz, vol 1, 79; 1, 83.
Aiken, vol. 1, 306.
Addis, vol. 1, [206].
Alger, vol. 1, [207].
Alzog, vol. 2, 455, 607, 634, 649.
Allnatt, vol. 2, 481.
Arnold, vol 1, [206].
American Ecclesiastical Review vol. 1, 183.
American Catholic Quarterly, vol. 2, 576.
Aksakow, vol. 2, 459.
Audin, vol. 2, 562.

Bacon, Roger, vol. 2, 733.
Bacon, Lord, vol. 2, 733.
Balmes, vol. 1, [206], 265; vol. 2, 576, 606.
Baluffi, vol. 1, 234.
Bainvel, vol. 1, 32.
Baunard, vol. 1, 14.
Bellarmin, vol. 1, [130]; vol. 2, 424, 481.
Bergier, vol. 1, [205], 168; vol. 2, 606.
Brownson, vol. 1, [41], [79], 55, 104; vol. 2, 499, 509, 532, 576, 607, 640, 648, 655, 659, 685, 701.
Boedder, vol. 1, [41], [79], [108], [130].
Brandi, vol. 2, 431.
Bridgett, vol. 2, 664.
Brownlow, vol. 2, 685.
Bradley, vol. 2, 613.
Bollandists, vol. 1, 225; vol. 2, 399.
Bossuet, vol. 1, 233.
Broeckaert, vol. 2, 532.
Bottalla, Pope Honorius I. before the Tribunal of Reason and History vol. 1, 508.
Buckley, vol. 1, 317, 327.

Champollion, vol. 1, 138.
Chateaubriand, vol. 1, 265.
Chillinworth, vol. 2, 426.
Caussette, vol. 1, 94.
Couchy, vol. 1, 351.
Capel, vol. 2, 402, 421.
Cobbett, vol. 2, 419.
Casey, vol. 2, 431, 509.
Clarke, The Existence of God, a dialogue, vol. 1, [83].
Condamin, The Bible and Assyriology, vol. 1, 122.
Copernicus, vol. 11, 614.
Catholic Truth Society, vol. 2, 576.
Conway, vol. 2, 576.

Darwin, vol. 1, 76.
Darras, vol. 1, 132.
Dangers of Spiritualism, published by Herder, vol. 1, 187.
DeMaistre, vol. 1, [89].
Desmond, vol. 2, 607.
De Cusa, vol. 2, 620.
Drane, vol. 2, 729.
Draper, vol. 2, 733.
DeLammenais, vol. 1, 349.
DeHarlez, vol. 1, 291, 305.
Digby, vol. 1, 283, vol. 2, 693.
Donckt, vol, 1, 314.

Ecclesiastical Review, vol. 2, 576.
Eagan, vol. 2, 715.
Epinois, vol. 2, 623.
Elliott, vol. 1, 344
Ebers, vol. 1, 127.
Elam, vol. 1, 79, 95,
Etudes, vol, 1, [14], [144], 132,
Euler, vol. 1, 166,
England (Bishop,) vol, 2, 577.

Faith of Catholics, vol. 2, 431.
Faá di Bruno, vol. 2, 481.
Flavius Josephus, vol. 1, 231.

Felix, vol. 1, 207.
Fredet, vol. 1, 231.
Franzelin, vol. 2, 445.
Freundler, vol. 1, [207].
Freppell, vol. 1, 46.
Fouard, vol. 1, 140; vol. 2, 481.
Fox, vol. 1, [42].
Flint, vol. 1, 317.
Ferreiroa, vol. 2, 660.

Gagarin, vol. 2, 455.
Gibbons, Cardinal, vol. 1, 265.
Gibbon, vol. 2, 242.
Gigot, vol. 2, 581.
Grotius, vol. 2, 637.
Goesbriand, vol. 1, 140.
Gonzales, vol. 1, 61.
Galileo, vol. 2, 608.
Goschler, vol. 1, 606.
Grisar, vol. 2, 478, 627.
Gregory XIII, vol. 2, 626, 710, note.
Gosselin, vol. 2, 650.
Gorini, vol. 2, 650.
Guggenberger, vol. 2, 455.

Hammerstein, vol. 1, [41].
Hammelauer, vol. 1, 55.
Haulleville, vol. 2, 705.
Haeckel, vol. 1, 76.
Heiss, vol. 1, 140.
Héfélé, vol. 2, 606.
Hay, vol. 2, 576.
Hergenroether, vol. 2, 386.
Hurter, vol. 2, 650.
Hugo, Victor, vol. 2, 715.
Huxley, vol. 1, 76, 79, 85.

Irish Ecclesiastical Record, vol. 1, [206], vol. 2, 509, 608, 618.

Jaugey, vol. 1, [206], 305, vol. 2, 481, 601, 623.
Janssen, vol. 2, 409.
Jurieu, vol. 2, 369.
Jouffroy, vol. 2, 717.

Kenrick, vol. 2, 481, 607, 624, 634, 655, 660.
Keller, vol. 2, 479.
Kerroux, vol. 2, 563.
Kervyn de Lettenhove, vol. 2, 566, 625, 627.
Kneller, vol. 2, 479.
Kepler, vol. 1, [45]; vol. 2, 614.
Kinns, vol. 1, [29].
Knox, vol. 2, 501, 664.
Krusse, vol. 1, 117.

Lachand, vol. 2, 705.
Lapparent, vol. 1, [74], 108.
Lacordaire, vol. 1, [15]; vol. 2, 606.
Labis, vol. 2, 532.
Lamark, vol. 1, 76.
Laforet, vol. 2, 663.
Lessius, vol. 1, [108], [130], [175], [206].
Lepicier, vol. 1, [206].
Lescoeur, vol. 1, [206].
Le Pelletier, vol. 1, [61].
Lesley, vol. 2, 663.
Lecky, vol. 2, 565.
Leo XIII, vol. 2, 510, 523, 528, 684, 712.
Lilly, vol. 1, [42], [144].
Littré, vol. 1, [69].
Lindsay, vol. 2, 481.
Livius, St. Peter, Bishop of Rome, vol. 2, 481.
Littledale, vol. 2, 629.
Llorente, vol. 2, 596.
Lyell, vol. 1, 78.
Lyons, vol. 2, 509.

Maher, vol. 1, [175].
Martin, vol. 1, [175].
Maitland, vol. 2, 442, 736.
Maupied, vol. 1, 61.
Manning, Cardinal, vol. 1, 87, 270. The Temporal Power of the Vicar of Jesus Christ, vol. 2, 650.
Max-Müller, vol. 1, 117.
MacCarthy, vol. 1, 349.
McLaughlin, vol. 11, 509.
Maguire, Rev. P, vol. 431, 663.
Maguire, J. F. M. P., vol. 2, 705.
Manning, Rev. R., vol. 2, 663.
Mann, vol. 2, 693.
Mazzella, vol. 1, [130]; vol. 1, 122.
Messenger, The, vol. 1, 325.
Merry del Val, The Truth of Papal Claims, vol. 2, 509.
Mendive, Spanish Work of great value, entitled The Catholic Religion defended against rationalistic impostures, vol. 1, 557.
Miller, vol. 1, 67.
Milne-Edwards, vol. 1, 72,
Michand, vol. 2, 634.
Milner, vol. 2, 663.
Ming, vol. 1, [144].
Molina, vol. 1, [130].

Monsabré, vol. 1, [142].
Month, The, vol. 1, 206.
Morton, vol. 1, [207].
Molloy, vol. 1, 55.
Motais, vol. 1, 61.
Mortillet, vol. 1, 76.
Moigno, vol. 1, 104, 122, 227.
Montesquieu, vol. 2, 635.
Morris, vol. 1, 184.
Montayne, vol. 2, 524, 532, 607, 655.
Murray, Rev. P. of Maynooth, Ireland. A monumental work in Latin, three volumes, On the True Church of Christ, vol. 2, 364.

Nicolas, vol. 1. [206]; vol. 2, 566,
Nugent, vol. 2, 607.

Ozanam, vol. 2, 705.
Oxenham, vol. 1, 207.
Olivier, vol. 1, 66.
O'Reilly, vol. 2, 532.

Paglia, vol. 1, [206].
Passaglia, vol. 1, [200].
Paley, vol. 1, [79].
Palmieri, vol. 1, [130]; vol. 1, 104; vol. 2, 481.
Pasteur, vol. 1, 69.
Payen, vol. 1, 72.
Pastor, vol. 2, 397, 469.
Pallen, C. Condé, vol. 2, 532.
Parsons, vol. 1, 258; vol. 2, 397, 455, 607, 624, 634, 648, 660, 684.
Pfaff, vol. 1, 55.
Picard, vol. 1, [191].
Pirenne, vol. 2, 571.
Pie, vol. 2, 634.
Prescott, vol. 2, 597.
Preuss, vol. 1, 184.
Preston, vol. 1, [175].
Pouchet, vol. 1, 71.
Pouchand, vol. 1, 113.
Points of History, vol. 2, 566, 606, 624.
Purcell, vol. 2, 663.

Quatrefages, vol. 1, 69, 85, 93.

Rawlinson, vol. 1, 116, 122.
Reid, vol. 1, [207].
Reuss, vol. 1, [207].
Review of Scientific Questions (Belgian), vol. 1, 75.
Review, St. Louis Mo., by Preuss, vol. 2, 478, 481.
Rickaby, Jos., vol. 1, [144].
Rivington, vol. 2, 663.
Riche, vol. 2, 679.
Ricards, The Catholic Church and Modern Unbelief, vol. 2, 568, 693.
Ronayne, vol. 1, [41], [79], [108], [175].
Rhodes, vol. 2, 396.
Rousseau, vol. 1, 146; vol. 2, 716.
Rohrbacher, vol. 2, 455, 566.
Roads to Rome, vol. 2, 663.
Russo, vol. 1, [175]; vol. 2, 576.
Ryder, vol. 2, 481, 607, 613, 624.

Salmon, vol. 2, 509.
Saint-Ellier, vol. 1, [79].
Sarda y Salvany, vol. 2, 532, 556.
Secchi, vol. 1, 65.
Schouppe, vol. 1, [70]; vol. 2, 607, 645.
Schanz, vol. 1, [79], [175], 104, 122; vol. 2, 509, 705.
Scheeben, vol. 1, [108].
Schiffini, vol. 1, [108], [130].
Schultze, vol. 1, 72.
Schwann, vol. 1, 72.
Segneri, vol. 1, 343.
Shedd, vol. 1, [203].
Shinn, vol. 1, [187],
Schwickerath, Jesuit Education 1903, Herder, St. Louis, Mo., vol. 2, 723.
Silberschlag, vol. 1, 61.
Soleview, vol. 2, 459.
Slavin, vol. 1, [79].
Smarius, vol. 2, 663.
Spalding, vol. 2, 566.
Suarez, vol. 2, 387.
Southall, vol. 1, 112, 113, 114, 119, 127.
Stang, vol. 2, 415.
St. George Mivart, vol. 1, 77,

Tapparelli, vol. 2, 607.
Tertullian, vol. 1, 237.
Tiraboschi, vol. 2, 613.
Thomas-Aquinas (St.), vol. 1, [75]; vol. 2, 386.
Thein, vol. 1, [182], 104, 122; vol. 2, 481.
Thevenard, vol. 1, 62.
Thibaut, vol. 1, [14]; vol. 2, 401.
Thompson, vol. 1, 78.
Tongiorgi, vol. 1, [108], [175].
Topinard, vol. 1, 82.
Troplong, vol. 2, 680.

Tyndall, vol. 1, 79.

Urban VIII., vol. 2, 612.
Urraburu, vol. 1, [42], [104], [108], [144], [175].

Vaughan, Rev. J. S., vol. 1,[14], [42], [59], [76], [85]; vol. 2, 408, 698.
Vaughan, Most Rev. B., vol. 1, 97; vol. 2, 431, 437, 482.
Valensise, vol. 1, [175]
Vayrack, vol. 2, 607.
Vigouroux, vol. 1, [182], 65, 103, 104, 132.
Vogt, vol. 1, 76, 85.
Voigt, vol. 2, 650, 658.
Virchow, vol. 1, [51], 69, 73, 81, 82, 110.
Von Duerm, vol. 2, 655.

Walworth, The Gentle Skeptic, vol. 1, 30.
Wallon, vol. 1, 149.
Wainright, vol. 1, 97.
Weiss, vol. 2, 639.
Werner, vol. 2, 403.
Weninger, Apostolical and Infallible Authority of the Pope, vol. 2, 504.
Wendte, vol. 2, 664.
Wegg-Prosser, vol. 2, 624.
Wiseman, vol. 2, 729, 730.
Wright, vol. 1, 78.
Wynell, vol. 1, [41], [79], [206].

Yorke, vol. 2, 664.
Young, vol. 1, 265, 419, 705.

Zanecchia, vol. 2, 444.

JAN. 69
N. MANCHESTER,
INDIANA

39353000195337